X/a
.97/2
:v.128/
4

ROOM USE ONLY
DO NOT CIRCULATE

FEB - 4 1982

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
CITY OF NEW YORK
DOCUMENTS SERVICE CENTER

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 97th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 128 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1982 No. 4

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, we ask Your blessing upon the people of our world. With all the forces that separate us and the hatred which keeps us from appreciating our common humanity, we pray that our spirits will be enlightened by Your presence as we are given hope by Your promises. Give us the willingness to use our talents in ways that cause understanding between nations and give peace to troubled hearts. This we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 25, 1982, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE 97TH CONGRESS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding.

The U.S. Army Band (Pershing's Own), under the direction of Col. Eugene W. Allen, leader and commander, entered the door to the left of the Speaker, took the positions assigned to them, and presented a prelude concert.

The honored guests, the Honorable James Roosevelt, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt, Mrs. John Roosevelt, and grandchildren and great grandchildren of the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt entered the door to the right of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. James P. Molloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 220, the joint meeting to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt will come to order.

The Doorkeeper announced the flag of the United States.

The flag was carried into the Chamber by the Joint Armed Forces Color Guard.

The National Anthem was presented by the U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club, John Talley, director.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House.

The Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. The invocation will be given by the Rev. James David Ford, Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following invocation:

We ask Your blessing, O God, as we come together to celebrate the life of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to recall his deeds done for this Nation, and to dedicate ourselves to the tasks of our day. As we look to the past, O God, we are grateful for leaders who inspired and gave courage, who transcended the common level of life and who gave hope in difficult times. May the contributions of him whom we remember this day encourage each of us to face the concerns of our time that we may be worthy of the heritage that we have received as a free people. May Your providence continue to strengthen our hearts and bless our Nation that in all things we may truly do justice, love mercy and ever walk humbly with You. This we pray. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Color Guard will now post the colors.

The flag was posted, and the Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. We are honored today to have with us some of the members of the Roosevelt family, our former colleague, the Honorable James Roosevelt, Mr. Elliott Roosevelt, and Mrs. John Roosevelt, and the many grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the late President.

Will they all kindly rise, please? [Applause.]

We are also pleased to have some of the associates of the late President: Ms. Grace Tully, Mr. Benjamin Cohen, and Mr. James Rowe. [Applause.]

And from the President's home State of New York, the Honorable Hugh Carey, a former Member, and the Governor of New York. [Applause.]

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

We will now have a medley of songs by the U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club.

An interlude of songs was presented by the U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club.

□ 1110

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the noted author and historian of the Roosevelt age, Dr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. [Applause.]

Dr. **SCHLESINGER**. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, Members of Congress, friends, it is a high honor for me to share with three such doughty warriors for liberty and justice as Averill Harriman, CLAUDE PEPPER, and JENNINGS RANDOLPH the opportunity to address this most eminent legislative body in the world.

It is, indeed, a most special occasion that brings us together. We have heard all our lives about the first hundred days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. We gather today to celebrate his first hundred years.

This is not a partisan occasion. Franklin Roosevelt, as he liked to say, was an old campaigner who loved a good fight; but he was not a strict party man. He cast his first Presidential vote for a progressive Republican—after his own party had nominated a conservative Democrat. As President himself in 1933, he appointed two Republicans to his Cabinet. Seven years later, under the shadow of war, he appointed two more.

"People tell me," he observed at a Democratic party dinner in 1940, "that I hold to party ties less tenaciously than most of my predecessors in the Presidency, that I have too many people in my administration who are not active party Democrats. I admit the soft impeachment."

A few months before his death he was exploring the possibility of a political alliance with the very man whom the Republicans had run against him just 4 years earlier, and while we are contemplating the latitudinarianism with which Presidents sometimes regard political parties, it may not be amiss to recall that a Republican President, not too far from here today, cast his first four Presidential ballots for Franklin Roosevelt.

Jefferson put it classically in his first inaugural: "We have called by different names brethren of the same principle."

Today, to bring Jefferson up to date, we are all Democrats, we are all Republicans, as we join to honor a man who belongs not just to a party but to the essential history of this great Republic and to the intimate personal lives of most of us in this illustrious Chamber.

For Franklin Roosevelt led our Nation—led every one of us over the age of 50—save for the Civil War, in the two most grievious crises in our national life as a free state: the worst depression in American history and the greatest war in American history.

It is hard today to remember that America, now so rich and bountiful, was once, not too many years ago, a land of grim poverty and aching want, where millions who sought jobs could not find them, where factories stood empty and silent and crops rotted in the fields and men huddled in line to get a cup of soup and a piece of bread and children fought for food in garbage dumps.

Fifty years ago a blanket of despair was settling across the land. In the 1932 election, more than a million votes were cast for parties dedicated to the abolition of the capitalist system.

It is hard to remember today that America, now a great military superpower, was once, not too many years ago, a beset and embattled nation, its great warships sunk at Pearl Harbor, its new and inexperienced Army fighting for its life in North Africa and Italy, in France, and Guadalcanal, its gallant men dying on the Atlantic and the Pacific, in China, and in the skies over Japan. These terrible ordeals are now distant recollections. They recede in memory because we overcame them; and we overcame them in great part because of the exceptional qualities of leadership that Franklin Roosevelt brought to his high office—qualities that nerved his countrymen to fulfill their best and bravest selves.

An idealist in purpose, a realist in tactics, F. D. R. combined boldness and caution, openness and deviousness, compassion and ruthlessness, a genius for manipulation and a genius for inspiration. He not only enjoyed being President and communicated that enjoyment to the country, but he knew how to be President. He surrounded himself with singularly able and outspoken men and women and drove them successfully in the same harness. He fought depression and war with a White House staff far smaller than recent Presidents have required for less arduous challenges.

Roosevelt was a wonderfully effective President, because he had both the craft and the will to work steadily toward his objectives, and he was a great President because he loved this country, its meadows and plains, and forests, its spirited cities, its tranquil valleys, and its rushing streams; and because he imparted to the land he loved a noble vision of the future—the vision of a nation that could be humane and free and abundant, the vision of a world that could be ordered and peaceful and just. He embodied this vision in a glittering personality—intrepid, exhilarating, and serene. In many ways a conventional man, he had a zest for unconventional ideas. Nurtured in the securities of a patrician past, he faced with equanimity the terrors of a shadowed future. The world, he understood, was in the throes of incessant and inexorable change. Like Lincoln before him, he regarded the dogmas of the quiet past as inadequate to the stormy present.

"We must disenthrall ourselves," as Lincoln said, "and then we shall save our country."

Franklin Roosevelt saw politics as an educational process, a process of intellectual liberation, and he saw experiment as the method of democracy. He doubted that democracy could endure when one-third of the Nation was ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished. The urgent need, he liked to say, was to establish "a fair and just concert of interests"—to restore the balance of life and opportunity between business, labor, and agriculture, city and countryside, north and south and west, and he saw the national Government as the people's indispensable instrument in the abiding battle for balance, decency and justice.

We have a philosophical argument today between those who suppose that if we leave the economy to its own devices, our problems will solve themselves, and those who believe that Government has a vital role to play in promoting the general welfare.

□ 1120

No one can doubt where F. D. R. stood.

"The laissez faire attitude in face of human suffering," he said, "demanded not only greater stoicism but greater faith in immutable economic law and less faith in the ability of man to control what he has created than I, for one, can have."

Such views may not be popular at this moment, but the debate between private power and public purpose has gone on since the founding of the Republic. No one should think it to have been finally resolved in this particular year of grace.

F. D. R.'s response to economic crisis remolded the framework of American life, civilized our economic system, and restored popular faith in democratic institutions. Had the despair of the Depression deepened, the anti-Communist votes of 1932 would have become many millions in 1936 and 1940, but in fact by 1940, that vote had dwindled to a pathetic 150,000.

Business leaders did not altogether appreciate Roosevelt's efforts on their behalf, and called him a traitor to his class. The achievement of the New Deal, it may be said, was to save capitalism from the capitalists. [Applause.]

Roosevelt's revitalization of democracy had impact far beyond our own borders. This was a time when across the world fanatic ideologies sacrificed human beings on the altar of dogma. Against the intoxication of creeds and the tyranny of absolutes, Roosevelt fought the fight of decent men and women struggling day by day to make a better life for their children. He steered between the extremes of orthodoxy and revolution, moving always, as he said, slightly to the left of center.

"His impulse," said Winston Churchill, long before the glory of their wartime partnership, "Roosevelt's impulse is one which makes toward the fuller life of the masses of people in every land, and which, as it glows the brighter, may well eclipse both the lurid flames of German-Nordic self-assertion and the baleful, unnatural lights which are diffused from Soviet Russia."

Roosevelt understood that America could not be safe as a democratic island in the totalitarian world. He woke us from our isolationist slumbers and led us superbly through the agony of war itself.

The generation, the triumphs over the most devastating economic troubles and the most deadly military foes in our history showed the world that Americans are truly capable of.

We have our own great problems again, but it does no good to exaggerate their difficulty or our impotence in dealing with them. Crises ahead always look worse than crises surmounted. This does not prove that they are. Self-pity is one of human kind's ennobling traits. The crises that confronted Franklin Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln and George Washington were fairly considerable, too. As we meet the problems of our own age—and meet them we must—we can surely take heart from the memory of F. D. R. from his boundless courage, his inextinguishable gaiety, his hard understanding of power, his instinct for innovation, his confidence in the ability of man to control what he has created, and, above all, from his indestructible faith in democratic institutions and imperturbable trust in the strength of a free people, and his overflowing love of America.

Thank you. [Applause.]

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair will now present Miss Leontyne Price. [Applause.]

Miss Leontyne Price sang "American the Beautiful" and the "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

The **SPEAKER**. In the Congress of the United States there is but one man presently serving who was in the Chamber of the Congress as a Member during those eventful and memorable first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt. The Chair recognizes at this time the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Senator from West Virginia.

□ 1130

Senator **RANDOLPH**. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, I want to thank our colleagues of the Senate and House who by legislation, without partisanship, have brought this event into being. And ladies and gentlemen, and all those who may be listening and perhaps watching throughout America, today we commemorate the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He, as we know now in memory, and we knew then, was a national leader who sustained and enlarged the legion of a free society. As a youth he knew the world of wealth and privilege. As our President he gave hope to the homeless, he created jobs for the jobless and fostered the meaning of social and economic justice in American democracy.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, more perhaps than any President, saved this Nation from being torn asunder by class conflict.

On March 4, 1933, President Roosevelt spoke to an anguished and anxious and a divided people. Two days later, to save the financial institutions of our Republic, he proclaimed a national bank holiday, closing all of the banks of our country. On the following Thursday, March 9, the first day of the new Congress, which he called into an emergency session—Mr. Speaker, I say this to you and to all those who perhaps want to have something recorded which is a fact—the House passed, without a rollcall, that legislation. The Senate, by a vote of 73 to 7, passed that legislation. The President signed it. It was the Emergency Banking Act, and it was all done in that one day.

Thus began the New Deal, an experiment in using an unorthodox means to modify, but also to preserve the orthodox institutions of a free economy.

In that second week of March 1933 we were faced with the most extreme test of national purpose and will since the Civil War. Lincoln saved a Union divided against itself. Roosevelt saved a Nation in disarray by calling forth a shared vision. In both crises the American people had the good sense to elect a leader who drew from the fundamental moral wellsprings of our Nation.

Today we also commemorate the good fortune and the continuing wisdom of our American democracy.

The Roosevelt vision became the New Deal, and the New Deal worked. The New Deal created jobs, not leaf-raking jobs as was said by some then and mistakenly even repeated today, but jobs reclaiming and planting thousands of acres of forests, building more than 11,000 schools and thousands of libraries and other public facilities.

In 1938 millions of Americans were working for bare subsistence wages. Almost a third of our labor force was not working at all. Only 1 in 10 farm families was served by electricity. Annual per capita cash income for farm families had dropped to $48.

Now the New Deal brought hope where there was despair. It brought work where there was unwanted idleness. It brought unity of purpose where there was national chaos and much confusion.

The legislative reforms of the New Deal—I stress this—in banking and finance, in agriculture and conservation practices, in eliminating sweatshops and child labor and enabling working men and women to organize for collective bargaining, in creating some measure of security for the elderly, and in harnessing our rivers and generating electricity, that electricity going to farm and city homes alike, these reforms have changed the face of America and have been woven into the fabric of American life, and they will not be torn out.

Between 1921 and 1933 more than 10,000 banks closed their doors in this country, destroying faith in our most basic financial institutions.

On October 1, 1936, with the President running for reelection and campaigning in West Virginia, I was with him at the time he received a telegram from Washington. It informed him that for the first time in 55 years we had completed a full year without a single national bank failure. This was the President, I say advisedly, who was reviled as an enemy of capitalism.

In his first inaugural address the President declared his constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken Nation in the midst of a stricken world may require. Roosevelt did just that.

The actions of that first administration were not always guided by consistent economic theory. They were experimental. Yes; they were pragmatic. They were guided, however, by consistent moral purpose.

In his second inaugural address the President made that purpose explicit. He stated, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we add more to those who have too little.

"In our personal ambitions"—he continued—"we are individuals, but in our seeking for economic and political progress as a nation we all go up or else we all go down as one people."

Those words ring with truth, and they should, and I do believe they serve as a beacon for the generations of all Americans.

Thank you. [Applause.]

□ 1140

The **SPEAKER**. We have as a Member of the House of Representatives a gentleman from the State of Florida, who represented that State in the 1930's in the U.S. Senate, during the time of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I am happy to present to you the Representative from the State of Florida, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER. [Applause.]

Mr. **PEPPER**. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, my colleagues in the Congress, distinguished guests, and my fellow countrymen.

If beneficent providence—and we are happy to observe that providence has always seemed to be kindly disposed toward America—brought forth George Washington to gain our independence, Thomas Jefferson to teach us democracy, and Abraham Lincoln to save our Union, surely that same beneficent providence on March 4, 1933, lifted up Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his great wife Eleanor to rehabilitate and restore America and to

READEX FICHE

lead the free world to a great victory over a terrible despotism and tyranny. [Applause.]

The Nation upon which President Roosevelt looked that day was prostrate, almost, in body, and nearly broken in spirit. Not only were there millions unemployed, hundreds of thousands who had lost their homes and their farms to foreclosure; huts built in public parks were the only dwelling place for many more, with no food except what the soup kitchen would provide; and, perhaps even worse, groups of boys and girls out of school, hoboing from city to city like a pack of hungry wolves, seeking food, shelter, and a job.

But when that remarkable man began to speak to that audience standing in the snow around the inaugural platform and the millions listening over the radio in the land heard that marvelous voice, when they received the contagion of his dynamic spirit, when they sensed his own courage and confidence, in their hearts was born a new faith and a new hope, and upon that new faith and hope a new America was born.

I personally believe that when the man Franklin D. Roosevelt realized the awesome responsibility he assumed as he took the oath of office that day, his natural strength of character, refined in the crucible of long suffering, made a new Franklin D. Roosevelt—a man of even new courage and faith and confidence.

As long as free men shall write history, a brilliant chapter in the story of man will be about Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, about their years in the White House, their leadership of America, their leadership of the free world, and the kind of a nation and the kind of a world they left as legacies to their fellow citizens now and of succeeding generations. [Applause.]

It was my privilege from 1936 until he passed away to have enjoyed the privilege, like many of my colleagues, of working with President Roosevelt. I came from the South that needed help, and here was a helping hand. I proudly embraced it. And what he did for our South we shall never forget; what he did for America will live forever.

But those of us who had the privilege of personal contact with the President know that it was an immeasurable experience; always, to come into his presence was a thrilling exercise. You never knew exactly what sort of an experience you would have because he was full of ingenuity, full of innovation, full of doing things in his own peculiar way.

I remember one instance when I went to see him about a project that a lot of my people down in Florida were pressing me about. The President evidently knew what I was coming to talk about. He satisfied his mind that he had already done all he could to help me in that matter. So when I went in and sat down at the President's desk, he said, "Hello, Claude, how are you?"

I said, "Fine, Mr. President."

I got my breath and started to talk about my project. He said, "Claude, have you ever read very much about Robert Livingston?" He said, "Robert Livingston was one of my wife's ancestors. He was one of our greatest Americans."

Well, I was nodding my head and listening respectfully as the President went ahead, telling me about Robert Livingston. But he went on and on, and I was still nodding my head and had not said a word about my project. Finally, after a little while—and all of the Members of Congress know what that means—Marvin McIntyre, the President's appointment secretary, came in and took his place, standing there beside me. Well, of course, I knew that meant my time was up, and I had not said a word about my project. Well, I started to say, "Mr. President—" And by that time the cameramen were coming in, setting up their cameras, the press was pouring in and filling up the Oval Office, and in a little bit the President said, in his most ingratiating manner, "Claude, I am so glad that you came, I have enjoyed seeing you, come to see me again sometime." But I started to say, "But, Mr. President—" He said, "You know, I have got a press conference here now, Claude, and I cannot keep these people waiting. Thank you very much. I will see you soon."

Well, when I got back to my office I said, "Well, I did not make much progress on my project, but I am the best informed man on Robert Livingston there is on Capitol Hill." [Applause.]

There are three main legacies I venture to suggest which President Roosevelt left to our country and to the free world.

The first is: He showed by his own example and leadership that the Government of the United States belongs to the people of this land and that whenever their troubles and their disasters and their needs impel its use, it is available. It is the mightiest institution on the face of the Earth, and it can be a hand that will lift up the people if they call upon it.

There will be differences in the needs the people have for that Government, there will be differences in the attitude of those in charge of that Government toward the administration of such needs from time to time, but whenever the needs shall occur and be of sufficient gravity to make the demand proper and reasonable, you may be sure that the people of the United States will never let any President or any Congress forget that Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Congresses that worked with him came to the aid of a suffering people when they needed and they called upon it for help. [Applause.]

And a second great legacy President Roosevelt left to us, and that is that compassion, genuine concern for one's fellow man should be in the heart of every man or woman who assumes the awesome responsiblities of public office.

I rather believe that President Roosevelt would not have objected to every person, after taking the oath of public office, being required to reread Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan, to be reminded that he was simply not to operate a cold machine, he was to help as far as would be proper and possible, people to live richer, healthier, and happier lives.

I remember a lady from Warm Springs saying when she was a girl in Warm Springs she always loved to see the President whenever she could, and he often came to her home, and she said that as a girl she always looked upon the President as sort of a kind uncle.

Everywhere he touched, Roosevelt left the warmth of his generous spirit.

The third legacy is the place where he left America in center stage of world affairs. No more would another President have to pull a reluctant country to an acquaintance with its responsibilities against terrible despotism in the world. America, as Roosevelt left it, will be in center stage among the nations of the Earth, standing up for what is right, opposing what is wrong, and trying to build the institutions that will preserve the peace and the happiness of mankind.

So today we proudly commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of what they then called that fine baby boy to Sara Delano Roosevelt at Hyde Park. We proudly today attest our own respect, our admiration, and our affection for that great and good man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for his devotion to his God and his fellow man and his deep dedication to the service of both, and we leave him now again to sleep forever in honored glory with the lines spoken at Hyde Park by his old minister when he was laid to rest, the refrain of an old hymn:

Father, in Thy gracious keeping,
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping.

[Applause.]

The SPEAKER. I now have the distinct honor of recognizing a man who has been called on by his country on so many occasions, when America has had emergencies and needs, because of his many talents, the former Governor of the State of New York, and our great senior statesman, whom we all love, the Honorable Averell Harriman.

The Chair understands that Governor Harriman has laryngitis. His remarks will be read by the lovely and beautiful Mrs. Pamela Harriman.

Mrs. HARRIMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, I ask your indulgence.

Although Franklin Roosevelt was 9 years older, I knew him well as a young man. Eleanor Roosevelt's brother was a classmate of mine in school. I liked Roosevelt enormously. He was genial and friendly, but it never occurred to me that he would be one of our most famous national leaders. I believe his victorious fight over polio gave him the strength of character to lead the Nation at the time of great need.

I knew he wanted to be Governor of New York. In fact, Alfred Smith, in 1928, in retiring from the governorship and running for the Presidency, called Roosevelt and asked him if he would run. Roosevelt felt he had not learned sufficiently to walk after his attack of polio. But Eleanor Roosevelt took the telephone and told Smith, "Franklin will run."

When Roosevelt was elected President 4 years later, the country was in the most desperate economic situation of its history. He took hold of a nation deeply depressed, and in the famous "First 100 Days" gave hope. He took bold and untried action which gave a new spirit and confidence.

I came to Washington as a member of the Business Advisory Council which Roosevelt appointed. I was then asked to join the NRA. Uncontrolled competition had driven wages as low as 10 cents an hour and prices to bankruptcy levels. Industry was encouraged to join codes to fix prices and wages, with administration approval. Enthusiasm took the place of depression.

I remember 100,000 people marched up Fifth Avenue to celebrate.

The Supreme Court declared the NRA unconstitutional, as well as other acts, but later legislation legalized the best provisions, such as minimum wages and the right of workers to organize.

Years later, with the country strongly isolationist, Roosevelt feared the rise of Hitler's power in Europe and knew the United States had to play a role in world affairs.

In February 1941, Roosevelt sent me to England, then standing alone against the fury of Hitler's aggression. I was to report what Britain needed from the United States, short of America's entry into the war.

Thus Roosevelt authorized the first transpose program for Britain.

At the end of June, Hitler had attacked the Soviet Union and overrun the Soviet Army. Roosevelt met with Churchill at Newfoundland to discuss our mutual security and to proclaim the Atlantic Charter, out of which grew the United Nations. They sent Beaverbrook and myself to the Soviet Union to find out what help the Russians needed.

Roosevelt and Churchill supported the assistance the Soviets requested. The Soviet Union held out against Hitler's onslaught. Our food reached Leningrad before the end of the siege.

Stalin later acknowledged that the Soviet Union could not have survived without that help that Roosevelt sent.

Roosevelt met Stalin at Teheran in November 1943. At that meeting Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to invade the continent in the spring of 1944. Stalin agreed to launch an attack against the Nazi forces on the eastern front. There were 195 Nazi divisions in the east.

Stalin kept this agreement which led Roosevelt to believe that he could collaborate for keeping peace in the postwar world.

At the Yalta Conference in February 1945, the three leaders reached agreement on many subjects. Of particular significance was Poland, where it was agreed that a government of national unity would be established with a pledge to hold "free and unfettered elections." Unfortunately, this agreement and others made at Yalta, Stalin failed to carry out.

Roosevelt was deeply disturbed and sent a sharp message to Stalin. Unhappily, President Roosevelt died a few days later on April 12.

It was Stalin's actions which brought on the cold war. Roosevelt has been criticized for being taken in by Stalin and for unwisely trusting him. Nothing is more unfair. If he had failed to try, Roosevelt would have been held responsible for the breach between us.

Stalin's carrying out of his military commitments had given Roosevelt reason to try to obtain political commitments.

Had Roosevelt lived, things might have been different, but Stalin was determined to expand the domination of the Soviet Union wherever possible.

In any event, I am sure that Roosevelt died with hopes still in his heart that he could lead the world into cooperation for peace.

The hope President Roosevelt offered abroad was as great as the vision he inspired at home. [Applause.]

The U.S. Marine Drum and Bugle Corps (the Commandants' own) presented a musical interlude.

☐ 1200

The SPEAKER. We will now hear excerpts of addresses by F. D. R. narrated by his son, Jimmy, who served for so many years in this august body. Mr. James Roosevelt.

Mr. JAMES ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen: You will forgive me if I am a little moved by this whole very historic occasion. This joint meeting of Congress here in the Capitol of the United States in a place my father often spoke from is a fitting and wonderful tribute to him.

My brothers, Elliott, Franklin, Jr., and John's lovely wife, Irene, and all of the Roosevelt family join me in thanking you, Mr. Speaker, and you, Mr. Vice President, and especially Senator Jennings Randolph and Representative Claude Pepper who were so important to President Roosevelt's time.

We are grateful, too, for the presence of Governor Harriman, Governor Carey, and to all of you who have joined here today, and if I may be permitted a personal greeting to my former colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle and to my continuing friends in the Senate, I would like, on behalf of all my family, to tell you how greatly we all are moved and appreciate it.

My father's era was an era of radio. Television had not yet invaded our political life. Though he occupied the White House longer than any other American President, it was not his face or his figure that fixed his personality and character in the mind of the American people, it was his voice. On March 4, 1933, he was sworn in as the 32d President of the United States. Standing on the inaugural platform of the east steps of this building, his wasted legs held erect by steel braces, he addressed a nation facing economic despair, its banks closed and one-third of its work force without jobs.

F. D. R. recording: This is a day of national consecration and I am certain that on this day my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our people impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory.

It was the beginning of a new concept in Government. He called it a "New Deal" for the American people—the first time that the national leadership of this country assumed the duty to help provide the conditions in which those who were deprived and those who suffered might find a chance for a decent life.

F. D. R. recording: I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-fed, ill-nourished. But it is not in despair that I paint that picture for you. I paint it for you in hope—because the Nation, seeing and understanding the justice of it, proposes to paint it out. We are determined to make every American citizen the subject of his country's interest and concern; and we will never regard any faithful, law-abiding group within our borders as superfluous. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

He was never a man who harbored tired ideas: Large problems demanded creative solutions. Government should not be an alien force, but an intimate part in the lives of people. Some of his new programs would experience failure, but to him that was not as important as the trying.

F. D. R. recording: Governments can err, Presidents do make mistakes, but the immortal Dante tells us that divine justice weighs the sins of the cold-blooded and the sins of the warm-hearted in different scales. Better the occasional faults of a Government that lives in a spirit of charity than the consistent omissions of a Government frozen in the ice of its own indifference.

There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much is given. Of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

Mixed with his compassion was a fierce pragmatic mind. As friend and foe will attest, he thrived on political combat.

F. D. R. recording: These Republican leaders have not been content with attacks on me, or on my wife or on my sons. No, not content with that, they now include my little dog, Fala. Well, of course, I don't resent attacks, and my family doesn't resent attacks, but Fala does resent them. You know Fala is Scotch, and being a Scottie, as soon as he learned that the Republican fiction writers in Congress and out had concocted a story that I had left him behind on an Aleutian Island and had sent a destroyer back to find him—at a cost to the taxpayers of two or three, or eight or twenty million dollars—his Scotch soul was furious. He has not been the same dog since. I am accustomed to hearing malicious falsehoods about myself—such as that old, worm-eaten chestnut that I have represented myself as indispensable. But I think I have a right to resent, to object to libelous statements about my dog.

Ladies and gentlemen, I knew Fala well. He was almost a human dog, and he once told me in private that while he was Scottish, he above all was an American.

It was not easy to have a sense of humor in the 1940's. An ominous shadow had fallen over Europe. Hitler had annexed the Sudeten land, Austria, parts of Czechoslovakia. The German armies had invaded Poland. He, long before the American people, saw the danger and understood the consequences.

F. D. R. recording: We must be the great arsenal of democracy. For us this is an emergency as serious as war itself. We must apply ourselves to our task with the same resolution, the same sense of urgency, the same spirit of patriotism and sacrifice as we would show were we at war.

On January 6, 1941, America was at peace. The Battle of Britain had been won, but mainland Europe lay under the heel of the German Army. In the Old World, the flame of freedom had all but been extinguished. From the New World came a voice of hope.

F. D. R. recording: In these future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedon of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—which, translated into world terms, means a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.

□ 1220

Just over 41 years ago my father stood where I stand now and addressed a special joint session of Congress. The Nation listened, still stunned by an unprovoked attack on American territory the day before. Three thousand American sailors and soldiers had been killed at Pearl Harbor and a country waited in silence to hear the words of its Commander in Chief.

F. D. R. recording: Yesterday, December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan. No matter how long it may take us to overcome this premeditated invasion, the American people in their righteous might will win through to absolute victory. I believe that I interpret the will of the Congress and of the people when I assert that we will not only defend ourselves to the uttermost but will make it very certain that this form of treachery shall never again endanger us.

Hostilities exist. There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory, and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our armed forces, with the unbounding determination of our people, we will gain the inevitable triumph, so help us God.

My father died on April 12, 1945. He was at Warm Springs, Ga., a place he loved, and where he frequently sought sanctuary from the terrible burdens of the American Presidency. The next day he was to deliver a speech on the occasion of the annual Jefferson Day Dinner. The words were written, but they would not be delivered by him. I would like to speak them now to you:

Today, as we move against the terrible scourge of war—as we go forward toward the greatest contribution that any generation of human beings can make in this world—the contribution of lasting peace, I ask you to keep up your faith. I measure the sound, solid achievement that can be made at this time by the straight edge of your own confidence and your resolve. And to you, and to all Americans who dedicate themselves with us to the making of an abiding peace, I say: The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

Thank you very much. [Applause.]

The U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club rendered "The Navy Hymn."

The **SPEAKER**. The benediction will be given by Rev. Richard C. Halverson, Chaplain of the Senate.

The Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, L.L.D., D.D., offered the following benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift up the light of His countenance upon you and give you His peace, now and in the life everlasting. Amen.

The **SPEAKER**. In closing, please remain standing and join the Midshipmen Glee Club in singing "God Bless America."

The U.S. Naval Academy Midshipmen Glee Club, accompanied by the Members and guests, rendered "God Bless America."

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair declares the joint meeting dissolved.

The honored guests, the members of the President's Cabinet, and the ambassadors, ministers, and charges d'affaires of foreign governments retired from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the proceedings in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt were concluded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair wishes to announce that the House will continue in recess until the hour of 1:30 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER) at 1:30 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland."

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. **BOLLING**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE CONCERNING COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. **SWIFT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members be permitted 5 legislative days in which to entend their remarks and to include therein extraneous material on the centennial of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

● Mr. **BOLAND**. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that today's joint session of Congress be a focal point of the celebration of the centennial of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It was in this House, in addresses to joint sessions of other Congresses, that President Roosevelt announced some of the most important actions in the history of our country.

The word "crisis" is an example of a word the real meaning of which has become blurred through overuse. Today, occurrences which are the least bit out of the ordinary are labeled as crises. If you want a better understanding of what a crisis really is, consider the situation which confronted Franklin Roosevelt when he took office in 1933, and the events with which he had to deal in the years that followed. I believe that it is safe to say that no President has had to address problems of a magnitude greater than those addressed by Franklin Roosevelt.

When F. D. R. became President, this country was faced with an economic morass that threatened to destroy our social fabric. Millions of people were without work and millions more lacked food and shelter. Worst of all, the Great Depression had robbed many Americans of the belief that conditions could or would improve. Franklin Roosevelt not only sought to deal with those byproducts of the Depression which were most obvious, he also sought to transfuse the American spirit with a measure of the optimism which so characterized his personality. In both efforts he succeeded.

The challenge of a truly depressed economy would have been more than enough of a challenge for most administrations. Roosevelt, however, had to deal with not only an unprecedented economic situation at home, but an equally unprecedented global conflict. The demands associated with instituting a recovery from the Depression and marshaling the effort necessary to win World War II were intense. The United States is fortunate that it had a President with the ability and the will to see the job through.

The Roosevelt years unmistakably changed the character of the Federal Government in our country. Roosevelt saw that national problems demand a national solution and that the implementation of that solution has to be a task of the Federal Government. He believed that government, especially the Federal Government, has a responsibility to all its citizens—rich and poor, young and old. The extent of that responsibility, and the manner in which it should be discharged, still colors our political debate. In a very real sense the shadow of Franklin Roosevelt is with us today.

Perhaps it could be best said of F. D. R. that he was leader at a time when leadership was a scarce commodity. A man of courage, he was unafraid to take on those with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. He was a man who, though personally restricted by a paralyzing illness, believed fervently in the necessity of action. The 12 years of his Presidency were characterized by action on a scale few would have imagined and still fewer would have dared.

That the great experiment which our Nation began more than 200 years ago still endures is due as much to Franklin Roosevelt as to any other President in our history. The American people continue to be in his debt.●

● Mr. **ROSTENKOWSKI.** Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

In 1932 when Franklin Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency, the Nation was both economically and emotionally bankrupt—"Hoovervilles" of tar paper were sprouting on urban garbage dumps, jobless white-collar workers were peddling apples, and bread lines were becoming commonplace.

In his inaugural speech F. D. R. promised an aggressive approach to the crisis. And in his first 100 days a benchmark ever since for evaluating early Presidential performance—he shepherded 15 bills through Congress.

He was a man of intense sympathy for the human suffering that was pervasive in the America of the 1930's. In meeting this challenge of immediate crisis he also was mindful of the need for preventing the recurrence of such an economic collapse. Accordingly, the early New Deal legislation: the Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA), National Recovery Act (NRA), and Work Progress Act (WPA) all addressed the need for immediate recovery. While the later New Deal legislation: protection of the securities industry, fair labor standards legislation, and of course, social security, provided safeguards for our Nation's long-term health.

Despite his patrician background with education at Groton and Harvard, F. D. R. had a perceptive feel for the needs of less fortunate Americans. In fact, his ability to sense the needs of the common man whom he often called the forgotten man was quite keen. Yet while many of the Rooseveltian reforms were radical on their surface, they nonetheless blended well with such fundamental beliefs of American life as private sector strength and individual initiative.

F. D. R. was an innovative leader, one who broadened the scope of government from solely a servant of the rich to an advocate for individuals of all economic classes. The legacy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt is a system of government responsive to the overall needs of America.●

● Mr. **MARKS.** Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Joint Committee an Congressional Observances today, I am particularly pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on this, his centennial.

He was our President, communicator, domestic rallying point and wartime leader and Commander in Chief. No man in this century has had such a profound and lasting impact on America as we know it. He gave us persisting hope when we had none—nor any real reason to have any, other than his own burning belief in America's future.

Many of today's institutions which foster social and political stability and economic growth are direct results of the Roosevelt era and F. D. R.'s shaping of those years.

This is true not only in the United States but in much of the free world. The groping, pre-Keynesian political-economic theories which produced the beginnings of U.S. economic recovery in the midthirties are at work today in many places around the globe. The doctrines of national sovereignty and human rights contained in Roosevelt's foreign policy and found in the Charter of the United Nations, have served to influence, for the better, the course of developed and developing nation alike.

F. D. R. was one of the world's leaders at a point in time which was critical to the survival of civilization as we know it today. Threats to, and massive violations of, human rights were rampant. Standard bearers of this warring wave of repression and annihilation threatened the foundations of free societies like nothing ever witnessed on the planet.

F. D. R. was the true leader of Allied forces which preserved our world. Had he failed to gradually prepare the American people for what he knew was an inevitable conflict with Axis powers, the map of the world would be drastically different from what it is now—and with no guarantee the United States would have survived in a world dominated by flanking powers on both the Atlantic and Pacific.

In his first term, F. D. R. did have some trouble in preserving certain recovery programs like the NRA, which the Supreme Court rejected. He persisted, though, and the legacy of labor law protection, social security, minimum wages, securities regulation, and insured deposits are now integral parts of how Government helps regulate the economy and moderate cyclical swings.

That legacy is also the basis of the social contract which underpins the meaning of Government today—a contract between the American people and their Federal Government which helps assure social and economic justice for all. This President of the people was a man who fought to see included in the policy deliberations of his day those who previously were excluded. Entrenched forces of position and wealth fought against him but he prevailed and helped lay the groundwork for the betterment of those parts of American society we had ignored for so many years.

Not for nothing were those pictures of Americans from all walks of life disolving in tears as F. D. R.'s body moved up Pennsylvania Avenue back in April of 1945. They recognized in him that same gentle decency we honor today. A soldier said to a member of Roosevelt's Cabinet,

> I felt as if I knew him. . . . I felt as if he knew me—and I felt as if he liked me.

Mr. Speaker, F. D. R. was and remains an inspiration to America and the world. My first, and most vivid political experience took place back when I was 10 years old. My father drove the family the 15 miles from Sharon, Pa., across the border into Youngstown, Ohio. F. D. R. was to appear and my uncle was providing the automobile in which F. D. R. was to tour the area. What a thrill for a youngster to meet and actually talk with the President of the United States—and what a President. The impression he made on me persists to this day. It stimulated my interest in politics and had some influence on my decision to run for Congress.

Today, the economy of the Nation is in trouble. We find ourselves with high inflation rates, high unemployment, and high interest rates. We have moved to cut Federal spending and the tax burdens of many taxpayers. I trust this economic experiment will prove successful. However, I also hope that should this experiment falter badly or fail and that we will have the wisdom, compassion, and economic commonsense to make sure that those individuals and families devastated by this experiment will find in the Federal Government of today that same measure of timely assistance provided during the four terms of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier in my remarks about the hope that F. D. R. gave a dispirited and hungry nation. Conditions now are clearly not nearly as bad as they were in the depths of the Great Depression. Yet, on an individual basis, many families are experiencing the loss of everything they spend years to build. It is my hope that we in the Congress and the administration will remember during this time of trial not only F. D. R.'s exorcism of pervasive national fear but his commitment to the working man—the common man—every man.

In his second inagural address, F. D. R. said,

> We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics.

I hope every American can take those words to heart. I should like to see a renewal of a spirit of comity abroad and the disappearance of a spirit of self-centered meaness which seems to be on the increase.

Mr. Speaker, I trust I have not been too guilty of discussing issues during proceedings I helped design to honor a great American. However, I do believe that perhaps nothing so honors the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as invoking his words and spirit as inspiration and guide to the Nation during this year of his centenary and the year of our discontent.●

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as we pause to day to honor the 100th birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt, it is only fitting that we reflect on the course this Nation has charted in the half century since his Presidency and look to where we are heading today.

Despite our present economic dilemma, we are still a wealthy nation and remain the industrial envy of the world. By combining abundant natural resources with progressive social policies, we have created a middle-class citizenry unequaled in history—undreamed of 50 years ago. Even though deep pockets of poverty and social injustice persist, we have molded a system with more affluence for more people than in any other time or place in the history of the world.

In my mind there is no doubt that the farsightedness of F. D. R. made this possible. With skill, wit, and boundless compassion for the common people of this Nation he set us on a social course that lifted us from the deadly grip of the Great Depression and guided us to unprecedented prosperity.

Today we are at a crossroads—a place in history where we must decide to turn back or continue moving ahead. We must decide in these Chambers whether to abandon F. D. R. heritage that has been so kind to us. That is the choice we are being asked to make—in the name of returning to the "good old days."

To some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the good old days were those before F. D. R. Before workers had the right to organize, before there were human wage and hour laws, before there was social security, before there were Federal job and relief programs, before there was unemployment compensation and, yes, even before the Federal Government protected savings deposits in banks.

When I hear some of my brothers pine nostalgically for these romantic days of the past, I wonder how many of them pause to reflect on the number of business successes we would have today were it not for the programs that Franklin Roosevelt first set in motion. Those daring entrepreneurs who regale us with stories about how they lifted themselves with their own bootstraps might do well to consider that they succeeded only because the Nation prospered as it never had before.

In their initial skirmishes with the Great Depression, F. D. R.'s braintrusters saw production problems as the villain; the Nation was turning out too many goods. F. D. R. quickly spotted the error and concluded that the problem instead was at the consumer end. The need was to create more purchasing power.

One of the most remarkable qualities about F. D. R. was his flexibility. While he was deeply rooted in the old economics and bred into social traditions born of wealth, he was anything but doctrinaire. He fashioned social programs so that new economic theories would grow from them. Frequently his braintrusters would inveigh against trying something new and untested. He would reply:

> There is nothing to do but meet every day's problems as they come.

And always as he met those problems it was with the needs and welfare of all the people in mind.

From his pragmatism evolved the insight that by helping the poor and needy, the business community would also benefit.

This might be called the trickle-up theory of economics. It worked so well that it dragged millions of self-proclaimed, self-made successes to the top. We are now being asked to try again the trickle-down theory of economics, which has never helped anyone save the privileged class.

An early act of the New Deal was to protect the small homeowner from foreclosure. This it did. But it also provided relief for the mortgageholders and the bankers.

In the beginning, F. D. R. was deeply rooted to the notion that relief was a proper concern of States and communities. But he soon saw that the problems were not regional or local. He pushed through Federal grants, not loans, to the States and established the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to feed the hungry unemployed, recognizing that the States could not effectively deal with a problem so national in scope.

Neither did he rely on the States to provide jobs. Unemployment was a national problem. He realized that what happened in Mississippi or Maine would have ripple effects in New York and California. Then, as now, unemployment among the youth of the Nation was of specific concern. F. D. R. established the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I read in the newspapers that the States are laying off job counselors at employment offices because Federal funds have been slashed. As a result, job placements are down. There are not enough people to match skills with the few jobs that are still out there. I am certain that F. D. R. would not have been this shortsighted. He understood that the way to economic recovery was through putting people to work—not giving a tax break to the rich.

We are being asked now to turn back the clock and create a "new federalism." This ignores what F. D. R. saw so clearly, that we must attack our social problems nationally with countrywide standards.

In our highly industrial, complex society the unfortunate are the victims of national circumstances. Their welfare, therefore, is a national responsibility. In many, if not most cases, the disadvantaged owe their plights to decisions made at the Federal level. We make decisions here in Washington on matters ranging from imports to crop plantings. When someone in Alabama or Kansas is adversely affected by these decisions, then we have an obligation.

Obviously the legislatures in Kansas or Alabama cannot set import or national agriculture policies. Neither should they be expected to shoulder the burden for the pain that some may suffer to promote the good of all.

For 50 years we have been proceeding on the premise that the Federal Government had awakened to a new sense of responsibility and community. Now we are being asked to take the road back.

I, for one, am not ready to take that trip. I remember only too well what is at the end of that road. It was a time of hurt and despair.

I thought we had chosen a better way, where we came to understand that Government's role is to help those who need help—not to enhance the fortunes of the rich. F. D. R. put it this way in 1933:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have enough. It is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Franklin Roosevelt gave us hope—hope that all of us who wanted jobs would be able to have them, that those unable to work would be assisted compassionately and fairly and that we would have a measure of dignity in our old age.

I do not want to see that hope die, fade away, and be replaced with despair in the hearts of millions of poor and unemployed Americans.

In addressing the fears of the Great Depression, Roosevelt said that we needed plans "that build from the bottom up and not from the top down."

He said it well:

> We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics.

I think it is time to rededicate ourselves to the wisdom of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his concern for the little people of America.

If he were alive today I like to think he would have something like this to say: "What is good for the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid is good for General Motors."●

● Mr. **ANDERSON**. Mr. Speaker, it does not seem possible that 100 years have passed since one of our greatest American leaders was born. But, it is true. We are gathered here to give recognition to the fact that Franklin Delano Roosevelt entered this world 100 years ago this week. Some might say well, so what? But I think those of us who have served in Government for many years, and have seen the results of his leadership exercised during the unprecedented three plus terms he served in office, could not let this day go past unnoticed.

America has produced many leaders. Some have been great, some have been mediocre, and some have, regrettably, not been leaders at all, but simply persons occupying a leadership position. However, in the case of Franklin Roosevelt, he was a true leader in every sense of the word.

Many of us remember well the days during the terrible depression of the thirties when we had men with college degrees standing shivering in winter on street corners selling pencils and apples for a nickel apiece, and long lines of men happy to accept a cup of watered-down soup and stale bread and call that their daily meal. The cause of the Great Depression is, of course, the subject of many, many pages of documentary and many learned treaties. I shall not say more here, as suffice it to say that it was real, and it was grim.

Franklin Roosevelt assumed the Office of the Presidency at the height of the depression. He had no guideposts left from previous administrations pointing the way to recovery. This was a depression without precedent in our history. He started our recovery by inspiring the American people to work together, to have confidence, and above all, warned them that the greatest thing they had to fear was fear itself. Many innovative programs followed in quick succession. By prohibiting the private ownership of gold, by closing banks until audits could be performed, and by placing stringent controls upon banking activities, he reestablished confidence in our currency. Once that was done, he proceeded with a long line of actions which I shall not take time to recount in detail here. Jobs were needed and created to put America back to work. Such things as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) put men to work enhancing what we now call our environment and our natural resources. We had the Public Works Administration (PWA), which put men to work on building public works projects, some still in use today. The FDIC and FSLIC were formed to protect the deposits of investors in banks and savings institutions. And then, just when recovery was on the upswing, men were going to work, and the economy was moving forward, something much more ominous than even a terrible depression loomed on the horizon.

Many of us remember his fireside chats, when talking on the radio—and I must remind my younger listeners that there were no televisions at that time—Franklin Roosevelt established a bond between himself and the people. His wife Eleanor was constantly at his side and constantly in the public view, and even his little white dog Falla played a part in forming the Roosevelt image. And this image was necessary as a unifying focal point for our Nation, for in Europe the clouds of war were quickly gathering.

Roosevelt recognized that this Nation could not sit idly by and allow the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini to solidify all of Europe under their control, including the British Isles. He saw that even though he did not wish to spend money on rearmament, he must do so. And he had the tremendous courage to take an extremely unpopular act—to call up National Guard units and, to institute the draft. These were unpopular measures, even at that time, for many did not perceive the threat as did Roosevelt. And, in fact, some famous Americans such as the hero Lindberg, who first crossed the Atlantic by himself in an airplane, publicly spoke out in support of the German cause and stressed the might of German arms, counseling America not to become involved.

Another historic act was the bases-for-destroyers deal that Roosevelt made with Great Britain, giving a brave people across the sea 50 overage World War I four-stack destroyers in exchange for bases located on Caribbean Islands that formed a part of the British Empire. Some of these bases remain today for use both by our military and our space exploration efforts. And, when war did start for America, it came not from Europe as had been expected, but from the opposite direction with the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor. I do not believe that anyone who was living in those days can forget Roosevelt's speech to the Congress of the United States when he condemned the Japanese attack as a "day that will live in infamy."

Despite his crippling paralysis from youthful polio, Roosevelt was extremely active during the war years. He journeyed to meetings with leaders of other major wartime powers in Casablanca, Yalta, Tehran, and in the North Atlantic. Whether all of the decisions made at these meetings were the wisest ones is the subject of debate. But, and this is to his everlasting credit, he made decisions. He forged an alliance which saw the victory of Allied armies over those of the combined forces of Germany, Italy, Japan, and their lesser satellites. And, above all, he preserved that which our country stands for, the freedom of our people to live in peace, to voice their opinions, and to elect their leaders.

President Roosevelt died shortly before World War II was terminated. He died before he could see all of his efforts come to fruition. But, I do not believe anyone here doubts that the work done by this great man has seen us in good stead in the years since his death. His domestic programs have been expanded, in some cases modified, and when they had outlived their usefulness some have been abandoned. And so, my colleagues, it is with that thought in mind that we are assembled here today, to honor a great man who did so much for his country and to renew our faith in the ideals for which he stood; and, to remember that, because of his leadership we are still enjoying the four freedoms which he so clearly identified in a speech on January 6, 1941—freedom from want, freedom of worship, freedom of speech, and freedom from fear. It is a fitting tribute to a man who gave so much for so many. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.●

● Mr. **MICHEL**. Mr. Speaker, in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, we are not only asked to think about the life and times of F. D. R., but of the very meaning of democratic government in the United States.

It has been said that F. D. R. was more passionately loved and hated than any other American President. There can be no doubt as to his legitimate claim as one of the outstanding figures in the 20th century and, I think it fair to say, in American history.

So much happened during his four terms that it would be impossible for me to list the triumphs and the failures of this American leader.

What I would like to do, instead, is to quote a passage from a speech that is one of the most famous he ever made. It was made in Chicago, on July 2, 1932, on his acceptance of the nomination of his party to be its candidate for President.

Listen to what candidate F. D. R. said, before he became President:

> I know something of taxes. For three long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that Government—Federal and State and local—costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching. As an immediate program of action we must abolish useless offices. We must eliminate unnecessary functions of Government—functions, in fact, that are not definitely essential to the continuance of Government. We must merge, we must consolidate subdivisions of Government, and, like the private citizen, give up luxuries which we can no longer afford * * *
>
> By our example at Washington itself, we shall have the opportunity of pointing the way of economy to local government * * *
>
> I propose to you, my friends, and through you, that Government of all kinds, big and little, be made solvent and that the example be set by the President of the United States and his Cabinet.

That passage could easily have been slipped into last Tuesday's state of the Union message by President Reagan. No one would have known where it came from, since it reflects the policies of our current President.

Why do I raise this point? Only to demonstrate that throughout our history, basic principles remain the same. Big government is big government whether it is in the 1930's and 1940's or in the 1960's and 1970's. High taxes are high taxes, no matter who is President or what party is in power.

The words of Franklin Roosevelt, in his inaugural speech, remind us that some things never change. In that same speech he offered a program of relief—we would say welfare today—that would pay for itself. He never did manage to come up with such a program nor has any other President. But his ideal cannot be faulted.

Let us work together to see that F. D. R.'s stated ideals are put into practice today. That is the best tribute we can make to the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.●

● Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, few would dispute that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was one of our Nation's greatest President's.

He was an exceptional leader, of exceptional vision and exceptional abilities. He led our Nation through one of the most trying periods: Through its most severe economic decline, its greatest war, and into its greatest age of economic prosperity and social justice.

It is appropriate that we pay tribute to President Roosevelt today in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of his birth, not only because of his enormous contribution to the America we now know, but because of the many challenges that are being made to the New Deal today.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the following article by Lloyd Bruno, which appeared in the Sunday, January 24, Sacramento Bee, be inserted for the RECORD. As Mr. Bruno so aptly points out, there is still much we can learn from F. D. R. and the New Deal.

F. D. R.'S LIBERAL COMPASSION BECOMES SUPPLY-SIDERS' SCAPEGOAT

(By Lloyd Bruno)

Saturday will be the 100th birthday of FDR., a fact I am finding hard to accept, for to me FDR is still The President, much more alive than any of the nine worthies—more or less—who have come after him. Yet it is sober truth that Roosevelt now belongs to an age as remote from ours as Lincoln's was the year I was born.

For that reason it is hard to explain to those born since Roosevelt's death in 1945—and they are the majority of the population—what many of my own generation felt about him. Bright young persons who have studied about him in school take refuge in "charisma," a trendy word for a quality they have learned to distrust, except, perhaps in rock stars and football players.

"Hitler had it," they will tell you, "and so did Jim Jones. If he'd wanted to, Roosevelt could have been as big a dictator as either, and maybe done a lot more harm."

They may be right about the dictator bit. When FDR took office erstwhile "progressive" thinkers like Shaw and Steffens were crying up dictatorship as the sure route to social salvation, and the wife of the legendary Lindbergh assured us it was "the wave of the future."

That was when Hitler, crazed with heady brew of Aryanism, was erecting the menacing structure of the Third Reich on the ruins of the Weimar Republic. Mussolini, the sawdust Caesar, was busy reviving the grandeur of imperial Rome and making the trains run on time. And Joe Stalin was jailing his opponents and shipping the kulaks off to the Siberian tundra, in the holy name of the proletariat.

Yet FDR apparently felt no temptation to follow their example, though in March 1933, both Congress and the people were in the mood to grant him unlimited power had he asked for it. He believed, however, that traditional American democracy, with all its notorious shortcomings, was a safer refuge in times of crisis than any of the versions of despotism then being hawked under fancy ideological labels.

Perhaps I am naive, but I feel that FDR believed in democracy because he was not only a good man, but also a happy one. He thoroughly enjoyed life, and wanted his fellows to do likewise. In this respect he was poles removed from the dictators—sour, hate-ridden bundles of envy and resentment, every man jack of them. Neither had FDR anything in common with the communist or fascist intellectuals, whose fierce assault on democracy was fueled by festering grievances and a longing for revenge upon society.

FDR radiated delight in living. He was no ascetic and, I fear, no saint. The mad Hitler, who shaved with cold water, spurned sensual pleasures and looked with icy contempt on the ordinary man's love of creature comforts. Not so FDR; he reveled in the good things of life, right down to Old-Fashioned cocktails, which he mixed with surpassing expertise. Finding deep satisfaction in being alive, he wished the same boon for all. I think the basis of his belief in democracy was as simple as that—and as profound.

Much has been made of Roosevelt's patrician background, and it can be said that the Hudson River squirearchy to which his family belonged comes as near to aristocracy as this country can show. Yet Roosevelt was an aristocrat in the Jeffersonian mold: He sided wholeheartedly with the plain people, and in no spirit of condescension whatsoever. His sympathies were genuinely with "one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished."

For this stand, those he castigated as "economic royalists" labeled him "traitor to his class." This charge FDR always treated with contempt, for he considered himself far above the tycoons, fat cats and pious money-grubbers. True, he lived graciously off a modest fortune, but he dismissed the singlminded and insatiable pursuit of profits as a goal unworthy of a gentleman. He had, he once said, no objection to moneymaking, but he could not understand why those who devote their lives to it can never get enough.

I agree, FDR was fortune's favorite, born with a silver spoon in his mouth. He was sent to Groton, taken on expensive tours of Europe and emerged painlessly from Harvard with a "gentleman's C." He was a playboy and, I greatly fear, something of a ladies' man. Had he been living in Russia in 1917, Lenin would have had him shot as the pampered pet of privilege.

Yet how much more compassionate and appreciative of the common man's hard lot than the dour Hoover, the self-congratulatory Nixon, the smugly moralistic Reagan, all of whom, like Dickens' Bounderby, "made it" by hard work, and can see no reason why anyone, by earnest endeavor and ceaseless prayer, cannot emulate their example. I cannot help thinking of a line of Edgar Lee Master, "Beware, O republic, of the man who rises to power on one suspender."

Officially, of course, FDR's stock is low right now. The current preacher from the bully pulpit attributes all our woes to fifty years of waste, mismanagement and extravagence, initiated by—you've guessed it. Had FDR practiced supply-side, trickle-down, as expounded by Andrew Mellon, today we'd be solvent, moral and greatly loved, with the wicked Commies abjectly cringing at the mere mention of our name.

That sort of blather makes me think of a chipmunk trying to claw down Mount Shasta. The latest poll of 50 or so distinguished historians rated Roosevelt just below Lincoln and Washington.

"The test of our progress," Roosevelt said, "is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Let Ronald Reagan ponder that, and consider whether it is not time to quit using FDR as his scapegoat, and instead to make him his model.●

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today's joint session commemorating the F. D. R. centennial was a magnificent occasion. Franklin D. Roosevelt was indeed one of our very greatest Presidents and is well-deserving of celebration on this 100th anniversary of his birth.

As a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt centennial committee I want to express my appreciation to Peter Kovler of Chicago, chairman of the committee, for his work in arranging so many of the centennial activities. To borrow a phrase from today's Los Angeles Times, Peter Kovler was "the sparkplug" of the F. D. R. centennial and, in fact, its sine qua non.

I attach a piece on Kovler from today's Washington Post.

Homage to a Hero

Peter Kovler and the FDR Centennial

(By Ann L. Trebbe)

His office is bare. There is no typewriter, no portrait of a smiling wife, no pictures on the walls, no books on any shelves. There isn't even a stack of paperwork waiting to be done. A desk and a phone sit alone in a room in the Smithsonian's Museum of Natural History.

But that's all he needs, says 29-year-old Peter Kovler, breaking into a laugh to assure you he likes it that way.

As Saturday, the 100th birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, nears, Kovler, chairman of the National FDR Centennial Committee, executive director of the Congressional Committee for a Joint Congress and heir to the Jim Beam fortune, has seen his days become filled with a final frenzy.

A typical recent day went in part like this:

8:45 a.m. He's having breakfast at home with his wife, Judy. The phone rings. It's a committee member to discuss an FDR centennial problem.

He gets to his office. . . . A woman in San Mateo County, Calif., is on the line saying she saw a small item in a San Francisco newspaper about the FDR centennial. She wants to organize some Democrats to spend the evening together. How should she do it?

Off to Capital Hill for a meeting, lunch and press conference with Rep. Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) and Sen. Jennings Randolph (D-W.Va.).

Middle of the afternoon, working from the office of Rep. Sidney Yates (D-Ill.). He gets through a call to the secretary in his Chicago office and dictates a letter about celebrations in Miami, Denver, San Francisco and Chicago.

Kovler's friends, when they are able to slow him down, jokingly call him Franklin. A playwright friend recently gave him an FDR coloring book. His wife has started a scrapbook.

"FDR is full-time now," Kovler says earnestly, leaning over a ketchup-drenched hamburger he ordered at lunch. With the next bite, he tallies the count of FDR-related phone calls on an average day. "Dozens," he decides.

Last summer when Kovler, who was born seven years after FDR died, began to wonder what was being planned to recognize the anniversary of Roosevelt's 100th birthday, he found out that virtually nothing was being planned. The former Department of Commerce speechwriter was shocked and decided to start something himself. Soon he found himself head of the whole centenary project.

There's no doubt that Kovler's admiration of the former president got him the job. But there must be some reason a nice-guy-from-Chicago-too-young-to-have-been-there is in the midst of a Roosevelt hoopla like this. He says his parents didn't hang FDR's portraits above the mantle. Bread lines were never a part of his life, and although his father talked about FDR and his mother cried when he died, he was just one among many other heroes in the household. Patriotism is his defense.

"There's nothing wrong with patriotism," Kovler says, even though he describes growing up at a time when patriotism was apt to be mocked.

"I just assumed he was everyone's hero," Kovler says, his widening blue eyes a perfect match with his faded jeans. "Don't you think?"

Everyone's hero or not, Congress appropriated $225,000 to fund the commemorative festivities, including the Smithsonian's observance, which in size will be second only to its Bicentennial celebration. But in terms of presidential commemoratives, according to Kovler's research, it doesn't come close to Herbert Hoover's in 1974 when $7 million was spent.

"A considerable amount," says Kovler, his bushy brown mustache hovering over every word. "And a considerable amount for a figure I think everyone would say paled in comparison—to put it mildly—to Franklin D. Roosevelt."

But Kovler is more than pleased with the celebration plans, which include lectures, films, a three-hour television documentary and numerous exhibits, especially since he found out it usually takes three to five years to properly coordinate a tribute of this scale. He's convinced it will be a celebration fit for a president.

"It's common knowledge that Roosevelt saved the nation through two of the most major crises of the century," Kovler says, the hamburger long gone, but the FDR talk still flowing, "and that he was to America like Churchill to England, like Lincoln to the 19th century.

"I would like people to remember that there is nothing criminal about government," Kovler says. "Most people think that now, somehow, the government is the devil's tool, and I think you can show by teaching history, this history—the New Deal—that government is not the devil's tool".

Kovler walkes out onto the snowcovered sidewalk. He stops and turns around, an envelope tucked under his arm.

"Do you know where the Federal Express office is?"

Peter Kovler's got some last-minute FDR mail-outs.●

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, January 30 marks the 100th birthday of one of the finest and most compassionate Presidents in American history—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is appropriate that we honor him at a time when this Nation is in such desperate need of a leader of his caliber and vision. I feel it necessary for Americans to recommit themselves to the ideals of F. D. R.—especially, seeing how we now have a President who is working overtime to destroy many of the great and essential programs that were created under the Roosevelt administration.

Franklin Roosevelt had an admiration for the common man, a rare and valuable trait amongst politicians. He once said:

> We are poor indeed if this nation cannot afford to lift from every recess of American life the dread fear of the unemployed that they are not needed in this world.

Roosevelt realized that Americans are tough and determined individuals who want to work and want to play a part in making this Nation great. He also recognized that there are those—the elderly, the poverty stricken, the less fortunate—who are in dire need of Government assistance. We should all be thankful that F. D. R. did not look upon the needy as shifty and lazy—unlike some of the new rightists who have invaded this city. If he had, there may not be unemployment compensation or social security. Roosevelt taught us the importance of caring. Let me say, despite what we are hearing from the present administration, there is nothing wrong with caring about others.

In the foreign policy arena, F. D. R. was a master. He was free from the cold war mentality that has plagued every President since him. He believed in conducting American foreign policy in a positive manner in which we would remain loyal to our own values while remaining tolerant of different values.

Mr. Speaker, the editors of the New Republic magazine have written an excellent tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt entitled "The Roosevelt Century."

I submit the article at this point in the Record:

The Roosevelt Century

January 30 is the centenary of the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt. The nearly 37 years since he died have not been a hospitable time for American icons, past or present. So it is remarkable that there has been no dimming of his luster. He continues to be large in a way that none of his successors (and only a few of his predecessors) can begin to match. He is still the smiling demigod in the photograph on the following page—jaunty and confident, an infinitely reassuring father, a warm sun radiating blissful hope. His biographers—Schlesinger, Burns, Freidel, Leuchtenberg—take his greatness as a given, and indisputable fact that needs no defending, only elucidating. Some revisionist historian may yet try to revise him down to size, but the popular verdict is not likely to change. That verdict puts him on a par with Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln as a creator of American democracy. Franklin D. Roosevelt is the 20th century's addition to the roster of Founding Fathers.

At the beginning, enlightened opinion expected little from the squire of Hyde Park. The editors of this journal were among those he gradually, but decisively, won over. "No doubt many of Mr. Roosevelt's progressive supporters think his program really embodies a 'new deal,'" they wrote on the eve of the 1932 election. "But it embodies nothing that reaches to the heart of the existing system." A vote for Norman Thomas, the Socialist candidate, was urged instead. By 1936 the editors were recommending a vote for Roosevelt only if the contest with Landon looked close, and for Thomas (or the Communists' Earl Browder!) if FDR seemed to have it in the bag. But in 1940 and 1944 the magazine didn't bother to wait for the campaign. Both times it endorsed the President as soon as he was renominated. FDR had made himself the indispensable man—and to see how he did it, one need only look at the America he inherited and the America he left behind.

In 1932 the United States was bankrupt in every way. With millions out of work and unsheltered from the bitter winds of depression, the official ideology of the government in Washington was a mixture of self-deluded Babbitry and paralyzed despair. Abroad the country counted for little. Wilson's internationalist legacy had been wholly squandered. (Militarily, the U.S. was very far from being No. 1; shortly before FDR's inauguration, General Douglas MacArthur, then Army Chief of Staff, rated it at No. 17.) When FDR died, on April 12, 1945, the Allies were on the verge of victory over Hitler, and the United States was indisputably the most powerful nation in history. At the root of that victory was something deeper than military strength. The country had transformed itself, under President Roosevelt's leadership, into a working and workable democratic society, with the means and the will to provide its citizens with a decent life. Did the New Deal "reach to the heart of the existing system"? Perhaps not. But before 1932, that system didn't have a heart. FDR gave it one.

Many of the fights that stirred such passions in Roosevelt's day seem trivial today. The NRA's blue eagle, the court-packing plan, the supposed danger of a third term—these are now as quaint as an older ration book. And FDR's moral vision was sometimes cloudy: witness his internment of Japanese-Americans at the start of World War II and his failure to grasp the full horror of the Nazi atrocity against European Jewry.

Looking back, though, what most stand out today is the extraordinary creativity of his stewardship. Institution after institution that he helped bring into being—Social Security, unemployment insurance, the modern labor movement, the minimum wage—permanently changed American society for the better. Were some New Deal programs (such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which FDR thought would protect bad banks along with good ones) passed with only the reluctant consent of the President? No matter. Roosevelt created the New Deal's exhilarating atmosphere of fearless experimentation, and Roosevelt deserves the credit for its accomplishments.

In foreign policy FDR, who had campaigned for the League of Nations as the Democratic vice-presidental candidate in 1920, came to office as a member of neither the internationalist nor the isolationist camp. But he gradually educated the public to the need for a strong, active American role in the world. In his willingness to act he was always ahead of public opinion. He saw, when others did not, that liberty and democracy could not survive in America if they were expunged abroad. He understood that moral purity was not sufficient for liberty's defense against aggressive totalitarianism. Against massive opposition at home, he urged military preparedness and furnished the Allies with weapons with which to defend themselves and our common interests. It was thanks to his foresight that what he called "the American people in their righteous might" were as ready as they were for war when war came; and it is part of his legacy that since the war ended the American people have not again been seriously tempted—until our time, that is—by the kind of isolationism that he had inherited. When Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, FDR knew that "the peace of all countries is in danger." He proceeded to dismantle the structure of America's historic neutrality. He would have known what to do with reference to Poland today.

This wordly, happy man, so utterly without unctuous piety, was in fact a spiritual leader. "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," he said—and the country nearly wept with relief. He never entertained the slightest doubt that he could make the United States a stronger, more decent place. Writing in the New Republic on July 22, 1940, Hamilton Basso, with startling prescience, caught the essence of Roosevelt's contribution as well as anyone ever has, before or since. He wrote:

"FDR's place in history is secure, but only if the opponents of republicanism do not write the future history books. And here, in this qualification, we come to what may well be the true greatness—perhaps the accidental greatness—of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He emerges, out of the fog of a stormy time, as one of the great spokesmen of democracy—giving new articulation to those old and simple ideas which, if democracy is to survive, must truly be weapons.

"He came to the Presidency in a black moment of a black, black time. Democracy, as a form of government, was being laughed at and derided. Many of the intellectuals now loving it so noisily were . . . writing of America as jungle, America as wasteland, America as washed-up. There was a red dawn over Moscow that had not yet turned out to be merely a reflection of the bombed towns and burning villages of Finland and, at home, the desperate and the hungry were listening to Huey Long.

"It was then, in 1933, that Franklin D. Roosevelt began to carry the country forward to the modern stage of democratic realization—to the point, that is, where the immediate and direct interest of the government in the welfare of all its citizens is also recognized as a democratic principle."

That principle, it need hardly be added, is precisely what is under attack on the hundredth anniversary of Roosevelt's birth. It only enriches the irony that the leader of that attack is the man who, by quoting this greatest of Democrats in his acceptance speech to the 1980 Republican convention, confirmed the place of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the pantheon of nonpartisan American heroes. We have no quarrel with that. Ronald Reagan's astute decision to drape himself in the Roosevelt mantle was a backhanded tribute to the breadth of FDR's appeal and the universality of FDR's legacy. But it was also an audacious piece of political larceny—one that made skillful use of the superficial resonances between the two men. Like FDR in 1932, Reagan in 1980 was elected more for who he wasn't than for who he was. Like FDR, Reagan faced an incumbent, an uninspiring engineer-President, in a time of economic distress. Like FDR, Reagan offered a politics of expansiveness, hope, and possibility against a politics of scarcity and resignation. And, like FDR, Reagan as President began his term with a dynamic flurry of proposals for economic recovery, demonstrating a masterful sway over Congress in the process, and promising deep and lasting change in the relation of the American government to the American people.

But the similarities only make the differences, which are far more meaningful, stand out in sharper relief. None of FDR's successors have been his peers, so perhaps it is unfair to hold any of them to his standard. But Mr. Reagan, the "Republican FDR," has invited the comparison himself; and he has lately provided a pertinent text in a remarkable public television interview with Ben Wattenberg. Because it was broadcast on Christmas night—at the beginning of the one week each year when the press and public are at their least attentive—it passed almost unnoticed. In the interview, Mr. Wattenberg asked Mr. Reagan to explain his journey from New Deal Democrat to conservative Republican.

"The President. Well, it's true that when I cast my first vote, at age 21, it was for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, his first election. And it's true, if I look back, that—because, remember, this was the depths of the Depression. I got out of school and sought my place in the world of work in 1932, when the government was putting ads on the air, on radio, urging people not to leave home looking for work because there was no work. Stay home and wait and the government would do something for you. I got a job. I didn't stay home. But I don't mean it wasn't real—the problem, 25 percent unemployment.

"Mr. Wattenberg. This was the radio announcer job?

"The President. Yes. Now, I think in that whole era, it was a great traumatic experience for the nation, and so we had a kind of thought that we had a sick patient and medicine must be applied. But the Roosevelt that I voted for had promised to cut federal spending by 25 percent, had promised to return to the states and local communities authority and autonomy that had been unjustly seized by the federal government. . . .

"Mr. Wattenberg. And you supported him during all those years, right?

"The President. Oh, yes, and there was no question about his being a great war leader for this nation. And I think all of our attention turned to that. But, in the meantime, my own analysis is that people attracted to government and to government positions in those years, in many instances, did not view the medicine as temporary. If you remember, I was assailed during the campaign for saying that many of the New Dealers actually espoused what today has become an epithet—fascism—in that they spoke admiringly of how Mussolini had made the trains run on time. In other words, they saw in what he was doing a planned economy—private ownership, but government management of that ownership and that economy. Ickes, Harold Ickes, in his book, said that what we were striving for was a kind of modified form of communism. Well, I don't believe that that was really in Roosevelt's mind, and I think that, had he lived, and with the war over, we would have seen him using government the other way. Roosevelt at one time made a statement that the federal government had to get out of the business of—we didn't call it welfare then, we called it relief. But, as he explained, that the federal government was not the proper agency for that, and that the manner in which it was being done was demoralizing to the people that you were trying to help.

"Mr. Wattenberg. I'm a little bit turned around here."

Well, so are we—and so, dizzyingly, is the history of the New Deal. It scarcely seems possible that Mr. Reagan so profoundly misunderstands the era in which he came to maturity. One of the things that era teaches is that the essential difference between democracy and tyranny lies not in whether public or private entities manage the economy but in who owns, as it were, the government itself. Does a blend of private ownership and public planning really constitute fascism or communism? If so, then the only question is which of America's allies have gone fascist and which have gone communist—to say nothing of America itself.

Apart from the fractured political science, the interview illuminates two facets of President Reagan's mind and spirit that make a powerful contrast with President Roosevelt's. One has to do with empathy, the other with ideology.

Mr. Reagan understands perfectly that a business executive might need a government tax incentive to encourage him to invest. But he cannot see how a government loan to a college student from a lower-middle-class family or a nutrition allotment to a pregnant woman or a newborn child can be anything but demoralizing. He divides the country into producers and parasites, and the latter category includes not only those who for some reason cannot follow his example ("I got a job") but also the government itself. Roosevelt saw democratic government as the collective instrument by which the whole society could renew itself; for Reagan, that is the province only of the owners of wealth, and, grudgingly, of local authorities. Roosevelt, who began life with much, could empathize with those who had little. Reagan reverses the equation. Roosevelt, to use an old-fashioned phrase, had a social conscience. Reagan seems to have none.

Mr. Reagan is right that Governor Roosevelt, in his first campaign for the presidency, promised to reduce the federal budget. Indeed, FDR's initial program of massive cuts in government spending and massive relief for the jobless was an early instance of voodoo economics. But he was not wedded to any one approach. His blithe disdain for dogma, the despair of some of his advisers, was one of the keys to the success of his Administration. His was an ideology of values, not of mechanisms. During the first campaign, even as he was calling for balanced budget, he let his principled pragmatism shine through. "It is common sense to take a method and try it," he said. "If it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But above all, try something." And when the first New Deal, the New Deal of NRA and managed scarcity, failed to cure the Depression, out it went, and in came the second New Deal, the New Deal of social reform. Mr. Reagan, too, was elected partly out of a widespread sense that he would "above all, try something." But he seems to have only a single something to try. Last week after new figures showed the unemployment rate rapidly approaching 9 percent this was his lame defense of his economic program: "I don't known any other way to do it." He is a prisoner of an ideology—the wrong ideology at that.

The Democrats, willy-nilly, are FDR's true political legatees. They must build a house of their own in which to hang his portrait, and we have no doubt that in time they will. But for the moment they are like the listless heirs of some departed magnate, picking sadly over the threadbare furniture in a cobwebby mansion. They are shaken by the Republicans' success in building a coalition of the haves and the almost-haves—and they deserved to be shaken. As they grope for answers, their duty—the duty of all of us who share their values—is not only to defend Roosevelt's legacy but also to separate the wheat from the chaff in the Democratic programs that came after the New Deal. The successes of the New Frontier and the Great Society, from Medicare to the space program, were those that engaged the imaginations, and interests of the entire society. Where there were failures, political or substantive, they mostly came in programs that divided the country into its economic and ethnic components and then proceeded to "target" the benefits.

The great lesson that Franklin D. Roosevelt's career holds for his political descendants is to be found in the inclusiveness and universality of his social vision. The Democrats will err if they waste too much time genuflecting to the "private sector"—or any sector. Nor will they gain much for themselves or the country if they put too much stock in "compassion." Compassion is an excellent private virtue, but in public affairs it is too readily jettisoned, even by people of good will, if it is seen to clash with a broader common interest. The Democrats must learn to respect the real discontents of the American middle class—the fear of crime, the disgust with lousy schools, the creeping sense of social and economic disintegration. There are signs that the Democrats are beginning to do so. Finally, the Democrats must learn to unite the potential strength of the American underclass with that of the hard-pressed working people who are currently underwriting the Reagan Administration's experiment in economic royalism. These are the people who abstain in growing numbers with each succeeding election. They are the present equivalent of FDR's Forgotten Man. The Democratic Party can bring them back only with a political creed that stresses their potential as functioning members of a larger society, not as marginal objects of charity. But one-third of the American nation is no longer "ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished." That was FDR's achievement. Roosevelt's heirs will conduct themselves as if this advance was never made at the peril of turning the Democratic Party into a permanent minority party and, at that, largely a party of the minorities.

The next great wave of political and social reform in this country, we hope, will understand the value of human capital, not just the kind that buys machines; it will explore the possibilities of democracy in the workplace, not just in the electoral arena; it will look for ways to limit bureaucracies, not just protect them; it will use equity as a spur to productivity, not just as a tool of distributive justice. Roosevelt's America was open and unfinished; so is ours. More important than any particular scheme, more important even than any particular goal, will be the largeness of democratic spirit that was Franklin D. Roosevelt's distinctive and effortless gift.●

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, today we are celebrating the 100th anniversary of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birth. F. D. R. gave hope to a nation crushed by economic depression and world war and led it to renewed greatness. His New Deal for America has provided the basic structure of government for half a century. Indeed, many of us grew up knowing only F. D. R. as President; today, administrations come and go, but the long shadow cast by F. D. R. remains.

Todays joint session of Congress in President Roosevelt's honor is very appropriate, and I am pleased to have the privilege to attend. I hope that this centennial celebration will not only remind us of F. D. R.'s greatness, but will also spur the construction of the F. D. R. Memorial. There can be no better time than now to erect a fitting memorial to F. D. R.'s distinguished career as a public servant.

On Monday, January 25, the Senate Rules Committee reported Senate Joint Resolution 95, which authorizes the construction of the F. D. R. Memorial. This positive step brings us closer to the day when the F. D. R. Memorial Commission can bring its work to a successful end. As House Member of the F. D. R. Commission, I am well acquainted with the chronic delay that has afflicted efforts to build a memorial to F. D. R. The F. D. R. Memorial Commission was created by Congress in 1955, yet after 26 years and half a million dollars, we still do not have a memorial. Though many have faulted the F. D. R. Commission for this foot-dragging, Congress bears a share of the blame. Numerous proposals have been put forward, and all have been refused, except of course, the most recent proposal which has been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Park Service, and the Commission on Fine Arts. Only the Congress has thus far failed to move.

On the eve of the 100th anniversary of F. D. R.'s birth, we have before us a suitable memorial proposal. I hope this auspicious timing will prompt the Congress to authorize funding for the F. D. R. memorial as soon as possible.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who served as our Nation's Chief Executive during the years 1933-45, longer than any President before or since. I was privileged to work in his campaigns of 1936, 1940, and 1944.

Few men more profoundly affected the course of American public life than Franklin Roosevelt. He won a place unique in the hearts of our people and in the annals of the Nation. He earned that place by force of moral character, by boundless energy on behalf of the common good, and by holding before men and women the example of leadership untainted by selfish advantage.

The respect and esteem in which he was held reflected the sentiments of the Nation as a whole and, indeed, of people's good will throughout the world. To millions across the globe he embodied the ideals and aspirations of American democracy as very few men or women in this or any other century.

The record of F. D. R.'s service to State and Nation, service which continued in the midst of serious illness, is an impressive one. His political idealism found expression with his first surprising victory in a New York State election for State senator in 1910, at the age 29, from a district which had been dominated by Republicans for over 50 years. During World War I, he served as President Wilson's Assistant Secretary of the Navy, where he gained valuable foreign policy experience in Europe, and in 1920 he became a candidate for Vice President on the Democratic Party ticket headed by Gov. James M. Cox of Ohio. The candidates campaigned in favor of U.S. membership in the newly formed League of Nations and on other progressive innovations, but the country was not ready for such expressions of political idealism at that time.

Although tragically stricken with polio in 1921, Roosevelt's courage and fortitude continued to inspire progressive Democrats all over the Nation.

and at the urging of Al Smith, the Democratic Party's Presidential candidate in 1928, despite the need he felt to continue his treatments for polio in Warm Springs, Ga., he ran for Governor of New York where he won the election despite the failure of Smith to carry the State in his own election campaign. As Governor, he established a program of unemployment compensation, the first for that State, and successfully fought for legislation which reformed the public utilities, the State prison system, and initiated an old-age pension program. He won reelection in 1930 by a record vote.

Elected to the Presidency in 1932, by a sad and desperate Nation in the depths of the Great Depression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt maintained his good cheer and optimistic image and remained inexhaustibly hopeful and confident, grounded in a deep love for America and a commitment to freedom and dignity for all her citizens. Shortly before he took office in 1933, a banking panic began which compounded the misery of millions of citizens who had already lost their jobs, their homes, or their farms because of the national economic collapse. He initiated programs on behalf of average Americans, the "forgotten man," as he called them, designed to improve the economic condition of the country.

The many fundamental reforms of our Nation's economic and social systems, called the New Deal by President Roosevelt, were seen by him as the "use of the authority of government as an organized form of self-help for all classes and groups and sections of our country." He vigorously led Congress in the enactment of laws to reform the banking system, establish the right of collective bargaining, and create jobs and housing. He led in the enactment of the Social Security Act, the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as well as the laws establishing the Civilian Conservation Corps and many other agencies to assist in the financial recovery of all Americans.

The era of the New Deal was a remarkable and brilliant era in the history of democracy because the programs of the New Deal involved each and every American. Franklin Roosevelt never lost that zeal and that fire as a champion of all the people by espousing that it is good and it is right for people to share in the wealth of America, because he believed that a productive citizen is what makes a democratic country like ours strong. He firmly believed that each citizen who has produced for America and who contributed to the wealth of America must be remembered by America and not abandoned just because they fall ill or their working years are over.

Franklin Roosevelt's character and career alike were a vindication of democracy at a time marked by new forms of tyranny, political disillusion, and small-minded partisanship. No other politican proved to be so durable, so effective, and so productive in both war and peace. Few leaders in our history made so many contributions to the well-being of our beloved country, and President Roosevelt's high standards, his tender and compassionate interest in people, and his inspiring example of creative accomplishment shall live forever in the hearts and minds of all people.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is a special privilege to be a Member of Congress on this occasion when we pay tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt—one of this Nation's most important Presidents and clearly one of the most enduring of all figures in American history.

It was 1882, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was born in the beautiful community of Hyde Park, N.Y. He was a man who loved New York like few others. He served with great distinction as its Governor. Yet it was this position he was elected to after that—President of the United States where Roosevelt truly established himself as an American legend. He served in the office longer than any other President. He began his Presidency during the waning days of the depression and ended it with our triumphant victory in World War II.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt for many Americans is the only President they remember—for he had such an enormous influence over everyday life in America from 1932 until 1945. He took a nation out of despair and gave it hope. He transformed a nation and its sagging spirit to one with renewed confidence.

How do you pay an appropriate tribute to a man who served almost 4,000 days in the most difficult job in the world? How do you pay tribute to a man who guided us out of the depression and led us to victory in World War II when our very freedoms were challenged as never before? Today, we do our small share to honor a great American Franklin D. Roosevelt. I hope the day is not too far off when an appropriate memorial is placed in our Nation's Capital similar to those which honor this Nation's other great Presidents, Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson. We should make this a goal of the 97th Congress.●

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for generations of today to understand the utter hopelessness into which the people of our Nation fell at the onset of the Great Depression. While we certainly have economic problems, the growing recession most prominent among them, we now address them with a reasonable certainty that the economy will recover. This was not the case when, in 1929, the stock market crashed, banks began to fail, and people lost their sources of livelihood in record numbers. It was a time when not only the economy was deeply depressed, but the national spirit was one of despair.

The greatness of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose centennial we celebrate today, was to lift the national spirit so that the Nation could confront and solve its mighty problems and form the resolve to win a terrible war. Roosevelt approached national problems with the same high courage and resolve with which he had approached a seemingly insurmountable personal affliction—polio. In each case, he persisted where many others would have despaired, and he was not limited by the narrow confines of conventional wisdom.

Instead, he tried new ideas and approaches, a New Deal. Some programs succeeded, many did not. But through this process he forged a lasting structure of programs which helped to insure that never again would the banks fail, the poor and elderly be left without resort, and the economy so abruptly grind to a halt. He established a new role for Government, one of actively participating in and sustaining the economy in troubled times. While some have assailed this role, it is undeniable that the transformation wrought by Roosevelt helped to save our economic system by restoring faith in it.

Roosevelt also saved our Nation and our allies from a threat which many would have preferred to ignore. Nazi Germany came perilously close to winning its European war before the United States entered the Second World War. Yet Roosevelt, who may well have preserved democracy in this country, most certainly saved it in Western Europe. By sustaining Britain in its lonely struggle and, after Pearl Harbor, providing the leadership needed to enter the war, Roosevelt turned the tide of a fight to preserve the lives and liberties of millions.

So while the past is sometimes easy to forget, let us not forget Franklin Roosevelt, a man who confronted hopelessness and won.●

● Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, the best measure of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's greatness is in the tributes from people of such diverse political ideologies and beliefs.

Columnist Carl Rowan sums up his feelings this way: "The Roosevelt revolution generated and nurtured hope."

Even staunch conservative George Will speaks of F. D. R. in glowing terms:

> Radiating an infectious zest, he did the most important thing a President can do: he gave the nation a hopeful, and hence creative, stance toward the future.

F. D. R. was an outstanding individual and a great leader. He left us a truly splendid legacy. He transcended overwhelming physical limitations through the sheer force of his will and his raw courage. He gave us many of the most basic values we have come to take for granted—minimum wage protections, insured bank savings, the right to join labor unions, and the National Labor Relations Act. And he refused again and again to accept the possibility of anything except a triumph of the best principles, even in the worst circumstances.

But we should be wary of enshrining F. D. R. F. D. R. was a man of his time. He was a composite of strengths and weaknesses like we all are. In fact, it was these very human characteristics which made what he did even greater and endeared him to us all the more.

We all know that F. D. R. changed American life in such a fundamental way that whole political philosophies sprung up in reaction to his New Deal. He changed the very nature of the Presidency, making the Presidential office the head and heart of the Federal Government. His decisions affected the balance of world power and ultimately the course of American history. But most of all, he raised our country's morale and confidence at a time in this Nation's history when the outlook was the bleakest.

For this, we should all be grateful.

When I think of F. D. R., I think of the words of the Irish dramatist Brendan Behan:

> My only politics is that kids should be able to play in the summertime, old people should be able to keep warm in the winter, and everybody ought to eat at least one good meal a day.

Nowhere is that better exemplified than in the social security system F. D. R. created. It represents the most basic social compact between the Federal Government and the American people and a bonding of the generations. It changed people's basic concept of what their work and their American citizenship meant. In F. D. R.'s own words:

> It is the purpose of the government to see that not only the legitimate interests of the few are protected, but that the welfare and rights of the many are conserved.

Regrettably, our social security program is under heavy fire today. Slowly, despite our efforts in the House and the overwhelming public support, the American people are being deprived of their hard-earned social security benefits. This is something F. D. R. would not have tolerated, and neither should we.

F. D. R. left a mighty legacy, but not one to be enshrined or to remain static. Our challenge is to develop the dynamic spirit of caring that permeated all of his initiatives and policies. Even though today's circumstances are different, hopefully we do not have to relive history to discover that the purpose and necessity of the National Government is to respond to and be responsible to the American people.

Perhaps the ultimate tribute to the legacy of F. D. R. will come in our commitment to preserve the integrity of the social security system and the spirit of the many other programs his genius and foresight inspired.●

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on this 100th anniversary of his birth, every aspect of the life and administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt will be commented on; there is little to add to the mountains of commemorative tributes and critical discussions of a man who dominated American politics and society for over a decade. But I would ask what it was about F. D. R. which makes him seem so vital and important to us now, when many of his contemporaries who seemed at the time to be giants have been forgotten.

I think that F. D. R.'s central achievement was to make the fundamental commitment that government should protect the average citizen against the domination of enormous economic and social forces which interfered with normal daily life. Roosevelt did not want government dominating people or telling them what to do; he recognized, however, that government was responsible for some minimum standards of social decency in the face of threats too large for the individual to be able to control. It was not one program or another which made F. D. R. a giant, but his overall concern for the American people. Our Nation still owes him its gratitude.●

● Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 30, 1982, our Nation will be celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of a man who has become one of the few individuals in American history to rise above partisan politics in the minds of the people.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the 32d President of the United States, like Washington and Lincoln before him, has achieved a place in the hearts of Americans which places him above party, politics, or ideological debate. The lead article in the New Republic for January 27, 1982, cites President Reagan as "the man who, by quoting this greatest of Democrats in his acceptance speech to the 1980 Republican convention, confirmed the place of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the pantheon of nonpartisan American heroes."

The affection and awe in which Americans hold Franklin Delano Roosevelt does not alter the fact, however, that many of the programs which were instituted by his administration are still controversial. Nonetheless, none can deny that the Roosevelt administration had a profound influence on our way of life, and that 50 years after his first election, we still feel the ramifications of his administration.

Those of us from the mid-Hudson Valley of New York hold a special affection for our old neighbor, F. D. R., for he was born and raised on the banks of the Hudson. It was to his home in Hyde Park that he sought solice during the years of public service, and it was there that he was finally laid to eternal rest in 1945.

One of the most memorable episodes of my young life occurred at the National Boy Scout Jamboree held in Arlington, Va., in the late 1930's. My troop was camped next to the troop from the neighboring community of Hyde Park, which had constructed a miniature replica of the Roosevelt Hyde Park home. The President made a point of coming over to view their handiwork and to personally greet all of us from the Hudson Valley. To this day, I am impressed with the charismatic personality of the man; one of the few persons in our history who can truly be called "bigger than life."

Part of the reason that our Nation remembers and honors Roosevelt was his unparalleled skill at the political game. Louis J. Lefkowitz, who was my boss when I served as ah assistant attorney general of New York State back in the 1950's, was a young State assemblyman during Franklin Roosevelt's term as Governor, from 1929 until 1933. Mr. Lefkowitz was quoted in the New York Times earlier this week as describing Governor Roosevelt in this way: "He knew exactly what he wanted and was determined to get it."

That determination in Governor Roosevelt was soon made evident to all of us by President Roosevelt. At a time when millions of Americans were unemployed, when their life savings were extinguished in the hundreds of bank failures, when the entire financial structure of the Nation was threatened, he stated in his first inaugural address to the Nation:

> This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country to-day. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days. * * *"

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was unique among the giants of our history in that he did not lead us through one supreme crisis, as did Lincoln, but through two of the greatest crises our Nation has ever faced. No sooner had the economic depression begun to fade into history, than we were faced with the menace of Fascist militarism run rampant throughout the Far East and Europe.

Roosevelt shared with Lincoln the gift to grasp the significance which the events of his time held. Just as Lincoln almost alone among his contemporaries understood that a Southern victory in the War Between the States would signal the end of democratic government on a grand scale anywhere in the world, Roosevelt almost alone understood in the late 1930's that Hitler's racist expansionism—as well as Japan's military conquests—would in the end draw the United States into this titanic conflict. Roosevelt understood that the United States was, in the phrase of the time, the "arsenal of democracy." Roosevelt understood that the task of conquering the dark forces of Hitlerism and militarism would ultimately rest on the shoulders of Americans.

Like Lincoln, and like all of the great leaders of history, Roosevelt had the ability to concisely summarize the issues at hand in such a way that all could understand them. By summarizing the goals of the war in the famous Atlantic Charter with Prime Minister Churchill, by articulating the aims of the war in his "day of infamy" message to Congress, and by the fireside chats which continued throughout the war, Roosevelt again displayed his greatest talent: The talent to make us Americans believe that we are invincible. Without his leadership, the mammoth tasks of World War II would have been so much harder a burden to bear.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt died just weeks before the ultimate victory in that conflict, and weeks before his dream of a United Nations came to fruition. Last session, I had the honor of serving as a U.S. delegate to the U.N. General Assembly. There may well be no monument to this man that we can construct greater than the United Nations—the living and perpetual monument to the leadership, and hope, that Franklin Delano Roosevelt presented to all of the peoples on Earth.

This coming Saturday, ceremonies at Hyde Park, just across the Hudson River from my own 26th Congressional District of New York, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of this man, who now lies buried just a few feet from the site of his birth. Although President Roosevelt may have passed away physically, he will live on forever in the minds and hearts of the people as long as freedom, faith, and hope survive in the human existence.

Mr. Speaker, Franklin Delano Roosevelt will not be remembered just as a dynamic political leader, or even as a great New Yorker. He has achieved the ultimate accolade of being remembered as a great American.●

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, few if any statesman can compare to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is only appropriate that we remember F. D. R. on this the occasion of his 100th birthday. Throughout his public career, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was a committed champion of the common man. While he was Governor of the State of New York, Roosevelt assembled a program that provided tax relief to farmers and less expensive public utilities for consumers. He also pioneered the development of state supported old age pensions and unemployment insurance.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt ascended to the Presidency the economic situation of this country was desperate. Between 13 million and 15 million people were unemployed, most of the Nation's banks were closed, and industrial production was significantly depressed. In his inaugural address, Roosevelt immediately set about the task of restoring popular confidence. His own confidence was unmistakable:

> This great nation will endure, will revive and will prosper * * * the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror.

F. D. R. received bipartisan support, and he sought to maintain that consensus. His Cabinet was geographically as well as politically balanced and included for the first time, a woman—Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal encompassed a relief program which was far reaching. He first obtained from Congress funds to alleviate human suffering. Congress established the Federal Emergency Relief Administration which granted funds to State relief agencies for direct relief. Millions of homeowners and farmers were aided by mortgage relief.

Perhaps the key components of the New Deal program were acts which stimulated business enterprise and regenerated farm prosperity. The National Industrial Recovery Act had two facets. On the one hand, it provided a substantial appropriation for public works and on the other it encouraged management and labor to establish codes that would provide for fair trade practices, minimum wages, maximum hours, and collective bargaining for organized labor. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration focused on raising farm prices. Roosevelt's New deal program also saw the passage of the Works Progress Administration, the National Labor Relations Act, and most notably the Social Security Act which included both unemployment and old age insurance.

In 1932, F. D. R. said that the Presidency is preeminently a place of moral leadership. No President more completely espoused that concept. All Americans gained from the relief programs established by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The New Deal gave hope to the poor, minorities, the unemployed, and did much to again engender faith in government. Today, as we remember Franklin Delano Roosevelt on his 100th birthday, let us all pledge to work toward his principle goal—the improvement of the quality of life for all Americans.●

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt on the 100th anniversary of his birth.

A recent magazine article perhaps summed up F. D. R.'s contribution to our democracy, and his place in American history, best. They called him "the 20th century's addition to the roster of Founding Fathers." It is a very short roster, and F. D. R. surely belongs. Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and F. D. R. Each in his own way, these are the men who formed, and sustained, and reformed our Government.

For those of us who have never known any America but post-F. D. R. America, it is difficult to understand how much of what we take for granted we owe to F. D. R. It is not too much to say that he redefined government, and gave it a whole new identity.

To put it in the terms of recent political debate, the America F. D. R. left behind was indeed much better off than the America he inherited. He came to power at the blackest moment in a very black time; the nadir of the Great Depression. Americans had lost faith in business, in government, in themselves. In his first inaugural, F. D. R. told the country it had nothing to fear but fear itself, and people believed him.

The New Deal was marked by a really new approach to government, powered by the idea that the Government, the Federal Government, had a direct interest in and responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. So many New Deal programs, social security, unemployment insurance, and the labor law reforms, now seem so natural it is hard to imagine an America without them. Yet America before Roosevelt was without them, and was much worse off for it.

In foreign affairs, F. D. R. found America a second-rate power, of little account in the world, and left it the most powerful nation in history, triumphant in history's greatest war.

The strength that America brought to bear on the war, in terms of the aid we gave our allies through lend-lease and other programs before we entered the war as well as the spirit and bravery of our fighting men, was the result of F. D. R.'s foresight in recognizing the threat of fascism.

For 13 years F. D. R. led the Nation, through its most desperate time economically, and through its most perilous time militarily since the birth of the republic. He restored hope and faith and optimism to a people burden with despair, and when he died, millions of Americans for whom he was the embodiment of hope and faith and optimism wept. Their good fortune, and ours, was that his legacy provided the basis for a strong, prosperous, and free America.

In these times of economic distress and political uncertainty, we should all consider the Roosevelt legacy as we chart our Nation's future course.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be able to commemorate January 28 as the 100th anniversary birthday of our great 32d President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The achievements of this man are innumerable, serving as President for more than 12 years and being the only President elected for an unprecedented four times.

He was a man who displayed personal courage, giving the people of the United States the strength to fight against the economic deprivation that plagued this country during the 1930's, as well as the courage to fight during the Second World War.

Among his notable accomplishments and offices held, he served as New York State senator, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and Governor of New York State before becoming President in 1932.

Although crippled by polio, President Roosevelt retained his youthfulnes and vitality, setting an example for the American people during the hard years of the Depression. The American people regarded him as a friend and a protector and thus he was able to unify the American work force.

He established numerous Government agencies such as the CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps), the TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority), and the NRA (National Recovery Administration), along with numerous Federal emergency relief programs, all of which helped America out of the Great Depression. He instilled confidence during the banking crisis and through his tax relief programs he relieved some of the burdens carried by the American farmers. Overall, his New Deal program enlisted the powers of our Federal Government as a means of restoring the economic prosperity of the 1920's.

President Roosevelt was a reformer and an innovator. He laid the groundwork for much of what exists in our Government today. He was able to mobilize the American people during periods of crisis as well as successfully lead the American people through the worst war that we ever experienced.

This man will continue to serve as a model commanding respect from generations to come. No one will ever forget his fireside chats, his achievements, and the warm personal relationship that he established with the people of the United States and the world.●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here today to join in paying tribute to a giant figure in our Nation's history, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of his birth date.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt stood for the one quality, above all, that characterizes our country: compassion. Compassion for the less fortunate in our society to whom we have a moral obligation to support. Compassion for those who are struggling to improve themselves to insure a more prosperous future for themselves and their children by giving them a hand. And, finally, compassion for our neighbors and those around us to whom we can offer help and from whom we can derive support and strength.

In many ways, it is this compassion that is the basis of our strength. For compassion is not a sign of weakness but of a commitment to improve ourselves and the lot of our fellow man. If ever there was a person in the right place at the right time, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was such a person. He combined enormous optimism, enthusiasm, and vigor, with a commitment to take command of the situation and charge full speed ahead with the work needed to get the job done.

He came into office at a time when the Nation was mired in despair and a paralysis of the spirit was evident. His electrifying first 100 days in office were the spark that put this country on the road to economic recovery and reform.

My first recollection that there is a person known as the President of the United States was when Franklin D. Roosevelt was President. I remember when I was 6 years old listening to the radio when he declared war on Japan; particularly I remember the strength and the conviction in his voice that, somehow, in the middle of all the despair and uncertainty around us, conveyed a belief that we would come out victorious. As Joseph Alsop so accurately states in a recent article in the Smithsonian magazine:

> Hope was in fact Franklin Roosevelt's greatest gift to his fellow American. Partly, he gave us hope by his deeds, when he came to office in a time that seemed utterly devoid of hope. But even more, he gave us hope because all could see that he himself felt not the slightest doubt about the future at any time in his years as President.

We are all aware of the extent of the impact of the laws enacted during the Roosevelt years. All Americans have been assured protection of their basic human needs under the philosophy which is the cornerstone of the new deal offered by Roosevelt.

As President Roosevelt stated during a message to Congress in 1941:

> We look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—anywhere in the world.

President Roosevelt recognized that, in an ever interrelated world, the old system of reliance solely on individual action and responsibility was no longer feasible. The rugged individualism that built our country is a great heritage and was essential to our development. But with our growth—both economically and in numbers—and with the astounding developments in the communications and natural sciences areas, our dependence on one another grew. It thus became important for the Federal Government to take the lead in insuring that our interrelation with one another is not translated into a dependence that is detrimental to individual dignity and human development, or that can be abused by those that have power over our daily lives. This interrelation is not limited within our country but also with other nations on Earth. As President Roosevelt states during his fourth inaugural address:

> We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations, far away. * * * We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.

It was this vision of the world which fueled our efforts not only toward economic recovery and reform but also during World War II.

President Roosevelt is admired and foundly remembered in Puerto Rico also because of his appointment of Rexford G. Tugwell as Governor. Governor Tugwell was a trusted member of Roosevelt's "brain trust" as an adviser particularly concerned about the plight of the small farmer and later on as head of the resettlement administration in the Department of Agriculture. His tenure in Puerto Rico—the last mainland-born appointed Governor—was characterized by laying the foundation for the economic development of Puerto Rico that turned around the island from the poorhouse of the Caribbean into a vibrant, progressive society.

I remember hearing on the radio of President Rosevelt's death when I was 10 years old and feeling as though a member of my own family had died. But the values and hopes for which he fought and which he represented carry on as his legacy to us. It is important that we continue to fight for them and to defend them even as we adapt them to the needs of our ever-changing Nation. The debt of gratitude owed by our country to President Roosevelt is being recognized and I, for one, pledge my continued support to the principles for which Franklin D. Roosevelt stood.●

● Mr. MATTOX. Mr. Speaker, this month we mark the 100th anniversary of one of our greatest Presidents—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This man who overcame the crippling effects of polio went on to lead our Nation through its gravest domestic crisis and most severe international challenge in this century.

In each case, he weathered the test.

In meeting these challenges, he left as his legacy programs that define our present-day social and economic system and a style of leadership that is the test against which we measure the performance of our Presidents today.

As we face a time of economic trial today, it is helpful to look back to see how F. D. R. met the grave economic challenge of his time and to see what lessons we can draw for ourselves today.

The programs enacted during the Roosevelt administration are now so much a part of the fabric of our society that we tend to take the benefits of these programs for granted. We assume they have always been there.

One way to appreciate the Roosevelt legacy is to remember what it was like before F. D. R.'s New Deal.

Before F. D. R., no Federal program provided the elderly with any degree of security in their retirement years. After F. D. R., there was social security.

Before F. D. R., no one's savings deposits were secure. After F. D. R., the Federal Government insured savings accounts.

Before F. D. R., adequate regulation of the securities market did not exist. After F. D. R., the stock market was regulated to protect investors and the larger economy.

Before F. D. R., workers could be fired for union activity. After F. D. R., the worker's right to organize into free trade unions was secured.

As Joe Alsop reminds us in his recent book on F. D. R., the Roosevelt legacy may be summed up by saying he included the excluded.

Until Roosevelt, many of the economic and political benefits of this land were denied to those who were not rich, not white, and not of an Anglo-Saxon Protestant background. F. D. R. began the process, still incomplete, of including the previously excluded groups of Americans into our society, economy, and politics.

Roosevelt's greatness lies not only in the programs he left us, but also in the way he exercised leadership. For many of us today, the way that F. D. R. exercised leadership still provides the model against which we evaluate contemporary Presidents.

What were some of the keys to F. D. R.'s effective leadership?

One key to his leadership was that he was a master communicator. F. D. R. was effective in all settings—large audiences as well as small groups. He was particularly effective in the use of radio, which was the most important means of communication in his time.

F. D. R. also had a gift of explaining some very complex ideas and proposals in a way that was understandable to everyone.

Another important element in his leadership was his emphasis on experimentation. F. D. R. was not a prisoner of any ideology. He wanted results. In order to achieve results, he was open to ideas from just about any source. If something did not work, he would reject it and try something else.

F. D. R. was also very effective in conveying a sense of optimism about the future. But it is not enough just to convey optimism. Such optimism has to be credible.

Many Presidents who try to convey optimism are unconvincing. Roosevelt's optimism, however, was believable. People believed that things would actually get better. They felt this way because they saw he actually had a program that was workable and was fair to everyone.

What useful lessons for today can we draw from the Roosevelt years?

First, we must not stray from the inclusionary principle laid down by F. D. R. It is the right path. It is the fairest. It has brought unequaled benefits to the people of our Nation.

But in following the path of F. D. R., we must also remember his emphasis on experimentation and results. We should continue his work but do it as he would have done it—with an openness to new ideas and an emphasis on what works.

Just like Roosevelt, we should not be blindly attached to policies of the past that have become outmoded. Our test should be what works. Conditions change. Problems are solved. We should be willing to reassess policies in the light of changing conditions. And if we decide that a policy is no longer appropriate, it is not an admission that the policy was always wrong. It is only an admission that it is not appropriate or useful under today's conditions.

To continue the work begun by F. D. R. of including the previously excluded and to do so in the manner of F. D. R.—with an openness to new ideas and a willingness to discard policies that don't work—this is how we can best honor the memory of F. D. R.●

● Mr. **SMITH** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in commemorating the 100th anniversary of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's birth. I can think of no better way to start the 2d session of this historical 97th Congress than to pay tribute to a man whose leadership and creativity helped restore a nation's confidence. President Roosevelt was a symbol of a time when Americans were able to triumph over great adversity. Americans were faced with the Great Depression, which left many families economically devastated, but Roosevelt was able to give the American people a new faith, hope, and dignity. We honor this great American President because he had the creative courage to reshape the role of government in order to tackle the economic problems facing the nation. President Roosevelt simply believed that the Government was responsible for the poor and jobless in society. With this sound wisdom, he expanded the role of the Federal Government by creating the New Deal, which provided the American people with such measures as unemployment insurance, old-age provisions, slum clearance, and low-income housing projects. In a time of economic crisis, President Roosevelt did not turn his back on the American people, but instead, he created an economic program that embraced the needs of the American people. What he gave to our Nation was far more than a New Deal, he created a government that had a deep sense of duty and responsibility in looking after the poor and jobless in our society.

As we pay tribute to this great leader of social justice, I find it appropriate that we now begin to rethink the priorities of this historical 97th Congress. It is time to implement an economic program that reflects the needs of our society. It is time to listen to the frustrations of our society. It is time to listen to the frustrations of our unemployed, and the suffering of our poor in order to find the same courage that Franklin Delano Roosevelt found, and create an economic program that is not tailored for the privileged, but one that fits the needs of all Americans.●

● Mr. **LEHMAN**. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. To honor him, one of my constituents, Barbara Ames, has written a poem called How Goes the Peace.

I would like to share this poem with my colleagues on this very special day.

How Goes the Peace

IN HONOR OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(By Barbara Ames)

There was a time not too long in our past
When free men of the world, immobilized
Watched an heroic band in mortal fray
With madness bent on torturing mankind,
The ravening force sought total mastery of all the world
We watched the battle, weeks passed into months,
Defending forces dwindled dangerously
And still we watched and waited, hypnotized,
Our fate and mankind's future on the scale,
Or slavery, to destroy us one by one,
Or liberty, hard earned through centuries.
Who can forget that knew the tyrant's might?
The drone of flying squadrons filled the sky,
The screaming rockets with their silent strike;
But still the brave fought on for liberty,
And still we watched with calculated calm,
And those of us who cared were agonized,
When would we lend our force to Britain's few
Or would we watch them totally destroyed.
The tension grew volcanic, free men prayed,
When from the East a rising sun burst forth
With fury on our reveling innocents.
A judgment come to ruin recovery's hope.
We were attacked and forced to make a stand.
Aligned at last with allies, friends once more.
The world was shaken by a grim ferocity
As free men everywhere saw truth at last.
The battle nearly won a wary friend
Joined to destroy our Western foe.
Two atom bombs and Eastern peace was won.
Half dazed, in shock and ill, our leaders met,
To forge a lasting peace for all mankind.
What did we win, and do we recognize
Tyranny as an ever threatening force?
Is noble sacrifice so soon forgot, the battle won.
Our children grow untaught the history.
That war was won indeed, how goes the peace?●

● Mr. **MAZZOLI**. Mr. Speaker, on this January 30, as we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of our Nation's 32d President, we pay tribute to an American whose courage and tenacity have been an inspiration to all. Obstacles and defeat were virtually unknown to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the man who led our Nation during one of the most difficult periods in American history.

Despite a handicap which left F. D. R. physically impaired, he rose to greatness in the eyes of his fellow Americans. Tackling the obstacles which confronted him, Mr. Roosevelt approached the Presidency fearlessly, working toward the American dream. F. D. R.'s New Deal offered new hope and a means for revitalizing the economy. Through his programs, F. D. R. once again started the Nation on the road to economic recovery.

Americans will long remember the fireside chats and the politics, but at this anniversary commemoration, let us not forget the man. Let us pay tribute to a man who has inspired Americans by his conquering spirit, his courage and commitment, his ability to rise again in times of defeat, and his dreams for a great society.

Today we need to recall the invincible spirit of F. D. R. In tackling the problems of the 1930's and 1940's, he demonstrated to all that "the only thing we have to fear, is fear itself." Fifty years later this is still good advice.●

SOCIAL SECURITY STUDENT BENEFITS

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been much concern expressed in the last few weeks over the impending phaseout of the social security student benefit. Many efforts are being made to squeeze into college as many high school seniors as possible before the May 1982 cutoff for new people entering the student benefit program.

The cutoff of student benefits was a budget reduction which passed this Congress last year with considerable support. The Ways and Means Committee proposed to postpone this action for 2 years so that high schoolers could have some notice, but that approach was rejected both by the Senate and by Gramm-Latta, and the May 1982 cutoff was set in law with the intention of excluding this year's high school seniors from the program.

I am concerned that these students are finding out about the change very late in the game, even though the Social Security Administration has made some effort to publicize it. I call on the SSA to do more to get the word out to students and their families so that they might know what to expect—and I would include in this not just the seniors but students already in college, who will suffer 25 percent annual cutbacks, and younger students who planned on this aid in the future. They need all possible advance notice.

To make matters more difficult, this benefit is being phased out at the same time alternative student aids are being cut severely. We must not endanger the education of our youth. We should hold up on further cutbacks until we see just what effect the current reductions will have.

WE SHOULD LEARN FROM HISTORY

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, they say everyone carriers around with him his own yardstick for measuring greatness.

That must be true, for in the midst of the present atmosphere of economic disaster, I find myself wishing every day we had a man in the White House like Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I do not suggest that the crisis of 1982 has yet reached the seriousness of that which faced Roosevelt when he was inaugurated President in 1933. But we will be foolish indeed if we underestimate the potential of the present administration's economic policies to buy us a calamity rivaling that of the early 1930's.

It is fitting that the Congress and the country pause this week to mark the centennial of Franklin Roosevelt's birth, and to remember with appropriate ceremonies throughout this year the greatness of the man and the legacy he left us.

President Roosevelt had already passed from the scene when I came to the House in 1949, nearly 4 years after his death. But I was old enough to have an awareness of his Presidency since I was serving as a county official during the early 1940's. And from the day of his inauguration I was aware of the impact of Roosevelt on people who suffered cruelly from the economic disaster which had befallen the Nation.

I was privileged to serve in this Chamber with two of his sons, James and Franklin, Jr. Congressman James Roosevelt was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor during my earlier years here. And both of them were good friends.

From the onset of the Great Depression in late 1929 until President Roosevelt's inaugural in March 1933, more than 4,000 banks in this country had failed, and the pace was accelerating.

In the month before the 1932 Presidential election, Nevada had been obliged to proclaim a bank holiday to preserve the financial institutions in that State. In February 1933, Louisiana suspended all banking activities, and 10 days later Michigan did the same. In March, many other States were in a similar situation. At last, on the morning of inauguration day, New York's Governor, Herbert H. Lehman, reluctantly followed suit, leaving the richest State in the Nation substantially without banking services.

In the final 2 weeks of President Hoover's term, depositors demonstrated their lack of confidence in their financial institutions by withdrawing more than $1 billion, and hoarding the cash.

President Roosevelt's first major act upon assuming office was to declare a 4-day bank holiday, commencing March 7, 1933—the Monday following his Saturday inaugural. Every bank in the United States was closed until the panic could be arrested and the sound ones sorted out from the weak.

Encouraged by the President's expressions of confidence in the future and by his energy in setting the wheels of Government whirling, the crisis in America's banking system was overcome.

It was clear that a major operation was necessary to save the banking system of the country and to restore the confidence of the people. That was the operation Franklin Roosevelt mounted and was able to pull the country back from financial collapse.

The late Walter Lippmann described those perilous days this way:

> At the end of February we were a congeries of disorderly, panic-stricken mobs and factions. In the 100 days from March to June, we became again an organized nation confident of our power to provide for our own security and to control our own destiny.

The character and the courage of Franklin D. Roosevelt were responsible for that victory over panic 49 years ago this winter. And there is a lesson in his Presidency that we should restudy in this winter of 1982.

Today, the jobless toll stands at 9.5 million, and climbing upward to 10 million—a ghastly goal we may reach when the next monthly accounting takes place.

Today, our housing industry is a basket case because of the tight money policies espoused by the President and the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Today, our automotive industry has come a cropper with sales plummeting and worker layoffs rising.

Today, business failures are reported on a steep upward climb as, one by one, businessmen fall before the financial juggernaut of high interest rates.

Today, farmers throughout the country are in trouble.

These are but a few of the warning flags that are flying from our economic battlements. They ought to tell us something.

They do. They tell us we need a man in the White House who will take command of the perilous situation and shake some economic sense into our monetary policies.

Franklin Roosevelt knew—and often said—that the banking industry stands in a special relationship to the people of a democratic society in that it is permitted only to operate for the service of the people. Banks were never intended to be our masters.

Banks lay prostrate and defeated 49 years ago, and President Roosevelt revived them on behalf of the people. They recovered their health and their arrogance. And within a few years began acting again like "economic royalists," as Roosevelt effectively described them.

It is now time for another President to remind them that they exist for us—and not the other way around. It is time for the President to take decisive action to bring interest rates down to sensible levels.

We should learn from history that if the rates are permitted to continue at current levels for much longer, they endanger the whole economic system.

Those of us who remember Franklin Roosevelt know what he would do when faced with a crisis in the economy such as plagues us now.

President Roosevelt's present day successor could profit by careful reading of 1933 history and so could this Congress.

DANIELSON REPORT

(Mr. DANIELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, responses to my most recent questionnaire sent to all of my constituents at yearend have now been tallied and I want to share those results with my colleagues.

You will note that President receives a considerably higher rating for a job well done from my constituents than the Congress receives. Opposition to wage and price controls is slightly higher than support. A similar small plurality of those opposed to 4-year terms for Members of the House outnumber supporters.

Sunday voting, however, met with approval by a 48- to 42-percent margin, and the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit gained an almost 3 to 1 edge of support. A law declaring that human life begins at conception was opposed by nearly 58 percent, with 35 percent favoring such a law.

It was interesting to note that the U.S. Postal Service, although receiving a favorable rating from less than half of the constituents who responded, ranked considerably higher in popularity than the other Federal agencies listed. I was proud to note, however, that my congressional office led all of the agencies, receiving a vote of support from nearly 63 percent of those responding, as opposed to less than 7 percent giving it an unfavorable rating.

The full text of the questionnaire, with results, is as follows:

DANIELSON REPORT—1982 QUESTIONNAIRE—YOUR VIEWS WILL HELP ME SERVE YOU BETTER

[In percent]

	Favor or approve	Oppose or disapprove	No opinion
1. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Reagan is handling his job as President?	56.8	36.6	6.6
2. Do you approve or disapprove of the way Congress is handling its job?	25.5	59.9	14.6
3. Would you favor or oppose having the government bring back wage and price controls?	44.4	47.5	8.1
4. How would you feel about changing the term of Members of the House Representatives from 2 years to 4 years? Would you favor or oppose this?	42.2	50.2	7.6
5. Do you favor or oppose keeping the present 55-mile-per-hour speed limit on the highways of the Nation?	72.8	24.1	3.1
6. It has been proposed that the United States supply China with military weapons if Russian troops move into Poland. Would you favor or oppose such action?	34.8	52.0	13.2
7. The U.S. Congress is considering a law which would declare human life begins at conception, and therefore abortion at any time could be considered a crime of murder. Would you favor or oppose such law?	35.1	57.8	7.1
8. Would you favor or oppose requiring all young men to give 1 year of service to the Nation—either in the military forces or in nonmilitary work here or abroad, such as work in hospitals or with elderly people?	78.6	17.5	3.9
9. Would you favor or oppose such a program for women?	60.4	33.5	6.1
10. In recent national elections, only about half those eligible to vote have actually gone to the polls. One proposal for increasing voter turnout is to make it more convenient to vote by holding national elections on Sunday, a nonworking day, instead of on Tuesday, as at present. Would you favor or oppose having election day on Sunday?	48.2	41.8	10.0
11. How likely do you think we are to get into a nuclear war within the next 10 years? Very likely 16.4 percent. Fairly likely 19.5 percent. Fairly unlikely 23.4 percent. Very unlikely 23.4 percent. Not sure 17.3 percent.			
12. Russia is said to be spending many times as much protecting its people from nuclear attack as the United States is spending. Do you think we should do more than we are now doing, do less, or do you think our present efforts are about right? Do more 51.6 percent. Do less 6.5 percent. Present efforts about right 26.6 percent. Not sure 15.3 percent.			
	Favorable	Unfavorable	Not sure
13. To help me in my continuing efforts to make the Federal Government more responsive and courteous to its citizens, please rate the following government agencies in accordance with your personal experience:			
U.S. Postal Service	43.9	50.8	5.3
Immigration and Naturalization Service	16.4	59.2	24.4
Veterans' Administration	29.9	37.0	33.1
Social Security Administration	36.7	47.0	16.3
Internal Revenue Service	37.8	46.4	15.8
My congressional office	62.7	6.7	30.6

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

(Mr. PARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be in attendance at the ceremony held earlier today in this Chamber honoring the commemoration of the 100th year of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

That occasion was the creation of a bipartisan effort to recognize the enormous contributions of this extraordinary man in a time of this Nation's most trying economic test.

Although I have never been a strong ideological ally of that President, and occasionally take issue with his political beliefs and his party affiliation, I was thoroughly impressed with the proceedings this morning. My colleagues were eloquent; and the music was magnificent. I enjoyed the ceremony immensely and I found it a truly moving and inspiring occasion in the finest traditions of America in honoring the dignity of free men and women in the political process of a Democratic society.

Occasionally, Mr. Speaker, our political system, which receives so much criticism and scorn, rise to the occasion, and this was truly one of those times. My heart is filled with pride to be a citizen of this Republic and a Member of this body.

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to address to House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was extremely pleased to hear the news reports concerning the release of General Dozier. I am happy for the general and for his family. I believe that the United States also owes a debt of gratitude to the Italian authorities for their successful action in location and freeing General Dòzier. Their continual and exhaustive activity in this regard is reflective of the high degree of professionalism in the Italian police and intelligence services.

In view of the release of General Dozier from Italian terrorists, I believe it is timely to commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the December 29, 1981, edition of the Wall Street Journal. The editorial, written by noted terrorism expert Claire Sterling, is entitled "General Dozier and the International Terror Network." I believe it helps dispel the notion that these terrorist operations are merely domestic expressions of extremism. Rather, using the terrorists' own words, the editorial shows that terrorist groups, acting in concert, are clearly engaged in an anti-United States, anti-NATO plan to undermine the West and benefit the Soviet Union.

While the editorial limits itself to just a few recent incidents, the broader picture must not be lost on the reader. The issue is not whether the Soviet Union approves in advance each and every terrorist incident in Western Europe. This is unnecessary. By providing training bases, both in the Soviet Union and the Third World, providing weapons, and providing money and documentation, the Soviet Union and their proxies are guilty of these heinous acts just as surely as if they had pulled the trigger themselves.

I am always saddened when I hear someone say that we must try to understand and accommodate the Soviet Union if we are to avoid a new cold war. I fear that such people are perceiving the Soviet Union through rose colored glasses. I must ask, when did the cold war end? Before or after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia? Before or after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan? Before or after the use of Soviet supplied chemical-biological weapons in Southeast Asia? How does the end of the cold war theory fit in with the current Soviet directed crackdown in Poland today?

No, I am afraid that as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the cold war has never ended. It has merely been continued under one guise or another. Today, they find that international terrorism is a promising vehicle, especially against open societies predicated upon individual liberty. Not only can they disavow direct involvement with a particular terrorist incident, but they reap the long term benefits from destabilization in the West. A terrorist act not only causes danger for those who are targets of the attack, but it undermines our basic liberty and freedom as strong counteraction is demanded to bring a halt to these acts.

For those of us in the West, the long term key to the situation will be how we effectively respond to international terrorism, while at the same time safeguarding those values and principles that serve as the foundation of our free society. As for the Soviet Union, we must keep their feet to the fire on this issue. They cannot be permitted to maintain the fiction that they are not involved in the problem. As much as being a war of violence, this is a war of propaganda. The West must come to grips with the problem. A stable society is at stake. We cannot let the Soviets off the hook.

The editorial follows.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 29, 1981]

GENERAL DOZIER AND THE INTERNATIONAL TERROR NETWORK

(By Claire Sterling)

ROME.—Some days after kidnapping Brig. Gen. James Lee Dozier—the first American they have laid a finger on in all these years—Raly's Red Brigades issued a lengthy communique explaining why. Four lines were devoted to their captive, a "Yankee pig" of high NATO rank in "the American occupation army." The remaining 11 pages offered an unusually revealing glimpse of the Red Brigades' true nature and intentions.

We now have it from the horse's mouth that there really is such a thing as an international terror network; that the most elite of its bands in Western Europe are mobilizing to "disarticulate . . . the pulsing heart of imperialist counter-revolution NATO"; that the U.S. is their supreme target and Soviet Russia the privileged recipient of their favors.

The communique speaks of this network as an "organization of Communist combat," whose main battalions encircling "NATO's heartland in Western Europe" are mentioned by name: the Red Brigades in Italy, the Red Army Faction (Baader-Meinhof Gang) in West Germany, the Provisional IRA in Northern Ireland, the Basque ETA in Spain. The last two, once restricted by "the suffocating optic of nationalism," are at last moving on "to a larger sphere of war" against the West.

"The revolution will be internationalist or there will be no revolution!" the document declares.

Its authors make no effort to disguise their immediate strategic objectives. They state bluntly that the U.S. is trying to thrust cruise and Pershing missiles upon its subalterns in NATO, and build a neutron bomb, so as to bargain with the Soviet Union "from a position of strength." That effort must be blocked at all costs, everywhere in Western Europe and especially in West Germany, "whose geographical position makes it an ideal base for a land attack on Soviet Russia." There lies the giveaway phrase.

Directly after this comes a telltale reference to Italy, "key link in the NATO chain from Spain to Turkey," and thus next in importance as "an area of intensified conflict."

Between them, therefore, Italy and West Germany are singled out for special terrorist attention as "front-line states," and understandably so: They happen to be the only two NATO states on the Continent committed firmly to the installation of cruise and Pershing missiles.

"War on imperialist war! War on NATO! War on the strategic centers of the American military machine!" the communique concludes, lest anyone might still miss the point.

Not a word in this text refers to Soviet Russia's SS-20 missiles, pointing westward with their triple nuclear warheads. There is no reference to Soviet occupation armies either, whether in far-off Afghanistan or next-door Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany and Poland—particularly Poland. Martial law was imposed in Poland and the brutal suppression of Polish workers began, just four days before Gen. Dozier was kidnapped in Verona. You would never know it from reading the Red Brigades' Communique Number One on People's Prisoner James Lee Dozier.

The ugly implications in such timing could scarcely escape notice here. Italy's popular cartoonist, Forattini, promptly drew a wily Leonid Brezhnev leering at his audience over the caption: "Keep your nose out of Poland, and I'll give you back Dozier." But that is surely too simple a view of the case.

What the timing does suggest is an elaborate, carefully studied, long planned campaign to divide, discredit, demoralize and ultimately disarm NATO, designed to coincide with the opening of superpower disarmament talks in Geneva—cited explicitly in the Red Brigades' communique—and a wave of pacifist, anti-nuclear and markedly anti-American sentiment in Europe.

This is certainly not to suggest that everybody who is against nuclear weapons in Europe is a terrorist. It is, rather, to suggest that the international terror network has set out deliberately to hook onto, and make full use of, everybody who is against nuclear weapons in Europe.

Its efforts to turn their eyes in one direction only are not so mysterious any more. The Red Brigades have told us more in that regard than we might reasonably have expected.

Their kidnapping of Gen. Dozier, deputy commander of NATO's land forces in southern Europe, was an early salvo in the network's new tactics for warfare, but not the first. Three months before he was kidnapped by terrorists in Italy, their counterparts in Germany had fired a Soviet-made RPG-7 rocket at the armored car of General Kreuzer, who commands all U.S. forces in Europe. Their missile missed him by inches. It was launched only a few weeks after 11 closely spaced bomb attacks on American military installations in Germany: The Baader-Meinhof Gang's first display of serious violence since 1977.

Everything points, then, to the likelihood of renewed, protracted and bitter terrorist, warfare in Europe, where a sanguine American public had assumed that the Red Brigades and Baader-Meinhof Gang (if not, perhaps, the IRA Provos and Basques in ETA) were as good as dead. Why would they die, when they can evidently count on bountiful, ongoing sustenance?

This does not augur well for Gen. Dozier. Anybody familiar with the Red Brigades' tactics would have seen through the cruel hoax of his announced execution just before Christmas. The Red Brigades would scarcely kill him off before milking the last drop of propaganda value out of his captivity, and that part of their program has just begun. Punctually, within days of his abduction, the slogan "Yenki Buoia" was added to Rome's rich collection of graffiti. That means "Yankee hangman," though the odd way Yankee is spelled suggests a non-Italian author. We have been there before, in the worst days of the "Yankee-Go-Home" Cold War. For reasons more sinister than mere historical accident, we may be getting there again.

FARMERS HIT BY ECONOMY

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 10 a.m. the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee will meet in emergency session to consider the necessity for allowing the Commodity Credit Corporation to borrow an additional $5 billion to keep programs vital to American farmers and American agriculture from grinding to a halt.

This action has become necessary because:

Farmgate prices for agricultural crops are in a state of depression and more and more farmers are being forced to put their crops under the CCC loan program;

Farmgate price depression is so serious that it is necessary for our farmers to receive deficiency payments for their crops, including wheat, cotton, and rice;

The general recession in the American economy is reducing demand in this Nation and the spreading recession in our international markets along with the increasing value of the dollar overseas is reducing our foreign markets for U.S. farm products; and

High interest rates are eating up the funds available to the CCC for operating its programs.

Should the Congress not act swiftly to approve this additional borrowing authority for the CCC, the Corporation will have to suspend program operations by mid-February by stop accepting crops for loans and will have to disrupt the issuance of deficiency payments including those for rice and cotton which are due in February.

The grim specter of a deteriorating American economy is raising its ugly head so that all Americans can see the stark reality of the consequences of the Reagan administration's economic policies.

While the administration did not produce the record worldwide harvests in 1981, the Reagan administration's high interest rate policies have managed to produce a stronger dollar overseas. The expensive American dollar in Western Europe, the Middle East, Latin America and the Orient cuts into the ability of foreign customers in those regions to buy American farm products.

The action we are taking tomorrow is noteworthy to the Nation because it is the first emergency economic action by the Congress in response to the Reagan administration's miscalculations and lack of planning to avoid the devastating effects its economic policies are having on all our people.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF STATE TO PROVIDE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING EXTRADITION PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ZIAD ABU EAIN

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the House, I move that the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 300) directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain information concerning the pending extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the material offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Zablocki).

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I call up for immediate consideration the resolution (H. Res. 300) directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain information concerning the pending extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 300

Resolved, That not later than seven days after the adoption of this resolution, the Secretary of State shall furnish to the House of Representatives full and complete information on the following:

(1) All documents in the possession of the Secretary relating to the Secretary's review of the proposed extradition of Ziad Abu Eain, including documents containing findings or recommendations with respect to the information and with respect to the issues that the Secretary should consider in determining whether to grant extradition or to exercise his discretion and deny extradition.

(2) All documents in the possession of the Secretary that were prepared by the Department of State and that relate to the extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain conducted by the United States magistrate, and all records in the possession of the Secretary of direct and indirect involvement of the Department of State in those proceedings.

(3) All documents in the possession of the Secretary concerning or containing recommendations with respect to whether the magistrate of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois should reopen the extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain in order to permit counsel for both parties to offer further evidence.

(4) Any document in the possession of the Secretary that identifies and explains or interprets the specific language in the Convention on Extradition between the United States and Israel that applies to and requires the extradition from the United States to Israel of persons who are not citizens of Israel or the United States, but are citizens of a third country.

(5) All documents in the possession of the Secretary containing findings or information relating to (A) human rights violations against persons extradited to Israel, (B) the treatment in Israel of Palestinians charged with terrorist or political offenses, or (C) the rights and protections accorded in Israel and the occupied territories to Palestinians and to Israeli citizens who are charged with criminal offenses.

(6) All documents in the possession of the Secretary describing adverse foreign policy repercussions if Ziad Abu Eain is extradited. All documents in the possession of the Secretary describing adverse foreign policy repercussions if Ziad Abú Eain is not extradited.

Mr. ZABLOCKI (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Danielson). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Zablocki) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Broomfield), the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain the action taken by the House Foreign Affairs Committee with regard to House Resolution 300, a privileged resolution of inquiry directing the Department of State to furnish the House certain information relating to the extradition of Ziad Abu Eain.

This resolution of inquiry was introduced on December 10, 1981, by the Honorable George Crockett and the Honorable John Conyers, and referred jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and on the Judiciary. On December 11, 1981, I wrote the Secretary of State requesting his comments on the resolution of inquiry.

On December 12, 1981, Ziad Abu Eain was surrendered to the authorities of the Government of Israel pursuant to a surrender warrant executed by Deputy Secretary of State Clark.

Subsequently, on January 18, 1982, the Department of State responded in the form of a letter from the Honorable Richard Fairbanks, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, and an attached Memorandum of Decision on the extradition of Ziad Abu Eain. Also made available to the committee by the executive branch were other documents requested in the resolution. At the end of my statement I will insert in the Record the text of the letter and the Memorandum of Decision, as well as a summary of the other documents submitted to the committee.

On January 26, 1982, the Committee on Foreign Affairs met in open session to consider House Resolution 300. During the course of the meeting the committee heard testimony from the cosponsors of the resolution, Mr. Crockett and Mr. Conyers and from Mr. Morris Draper, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Near East and South Asia; Mr. Daniel W. McGovern, Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State; and Mr. Roger Olson, Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Following the testimony and questioning of the witnesses, the committee agreed, with the concurrence of the cosponsors, that the Chair should seek to discharge the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees from further consideration of the resolution and to table said resolution in the House. It was further understood that the tabling of House Resolution 300 would not prejudice any futher actions on the part of the cosponsors relating to the subject matter addressed in the resolution.

SUMMARY OF MATERIAL REQUESTED BY THE RESOLUTION

1. Paragraph 1 requests full and complete information regarding the issues considered by the Secretary in determining whether to grant or deny extradition in this case. The Department of State has provided the Committee with a memorandum of decision, which is responsive to the request in paragraph 1.

2. Paragraph 2 asks for information regarding the Department of State's role in the extradition hearing conducted by the federal magistrate. The Department of State is providing the Committee with a letter from State Department Assistant Legal Adviser K. E. Malmborg to Thomas Sullivan, an Assistant United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois that sets out the Department's position on

the political offense issue. The Department is also providing the Committee with the testimony given by Assistant Legal Adviser Louis G. Fields at the extradition hearing. Both items are responsive to the request in paragraph 2.

3. Paragraph 3 asks for information regarding the question whether the magistrate should have reopened the extradition proceedings to permit counsel for both parties to offer further evidence. The Department of State has no information on this point.

4. Paragraph 4 asks for information regarding the question whether the Extradition Treaty Between the United States and Israel permits the United States to extradite to Israel a citizen of a third country. The Department of State has provided the Committee with a copy of the text of the extradition treaty between the United States and Israel. The Department is also providing the Committee with two letters between Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Jordan's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, that are responsive to the requests in paragraph 4.

5. Paragraph 5 asks for information concerning the human rights situation in Israel, particularly with reference to prosecution of Palestinians. The Department of State has provided the Committee with a copy of the Department of State's 1980 Human Rights Report on Israel.

6. Paragraph 6 requests all documents that describe adverse foreign policy repercussions if Ziad Abu Eain is or is not extradited. Mr. Morris Draper of the Department of State explained the foreign policy repercussions during the course of the full Committee hearing on February 26, 1982. His testimony is included in the transcript of the Committee hearing.

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1982.

Hon. Clement Zablocki,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Represenictives.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in response to your letter to Secretary Haig of December 11 requesting our comments on H. Res. 300 a resolution on inquiry concerning the extradition of Ziyad Abu Eain which was pending at the time of introduction of the resolution.

As you know, on December 12, 1981, Mr. Abu Eain was surrendered to authorities of the Government of Israel pursuant to a surrender warrant executed by Deputy Secretary Clark. The Deputy Secretary was not aware of H. Res. 300 when he made his decision.

Enclosed is a copy of the Memorandum of Decision signed by Deputy Secretary Clark on December 12 which explains in detail the reasons for his decision. If the Committee desires additional information, the Department of State will be happy to provide it either by briefing members and their staffs, or at a hearing.

I hope that this is responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely,
Richard Fairbanks,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Memorandum of Decision in the Case of the Request by the State of Israel for Extradition of Ziyad Abu Eain

SUMMARY AND DECISION

Ziyad Abu Eain is accused by the State of Israel of crimes which are claimed to subject him to extradition pursuant to the current 1963 Extradition Treaty between the United States and Israel. Acting in accordance with that treaty and implementing statutory law, Abu Eain was taken into custody by U.S. officials in response to Israel's request. A Magistrate for the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, determined after a hearing that Abu Eain should be extradited to stand trial in Israel. Abu Eain then sought a writ of habeas corpus from the District Court. After review of proceedings before the Magistrate, the petition for the writ was denied. The order of denial was affirmed on appeal by Abu Eain to the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Thereafter the United States Supreme Court denied Abu Eain's petition for writ of certiorari.

Abu Eain, having exhausted all avenues of judicial relief, has petitioned the Department of State for relief on grounds hereinafter discussed. Having responsibility to make a final judgment on the question of extradition, I have carefully considered all matters asserted by Abu Eain, his legal counsel and diplomats who have requested opportunity to address the question of extradition. I have concluded that our treaty with Israel and compelling law require a conclusion that Abu Eain be extradited. I have today signed the warrant surrendering Abu Eain to the state seeking extradition.

In contesting extradition, Abu Eain has raised three contentions: the evidence is insufficient to sustain the Magistrate's finding that there is probable cause to believe Abu Eain committed the crimes for which extradition is requested; the crimes charged against him are political offenses and thus are not extraditable crimes; and if extradited, Abu Eain would not receive a fair trial. These all raise legal issues, and none other than legal contentions have been considered in arriving at today's decision. They will be addressed in the order stated.

PROBABLE CAUSE

The Magistrate's finding of probable cause is based in large part on a statement of Jamal Hasen Ahmad Yasin (Yasin). In that statement Yasin confesses his own responsibility for the crimes charged against Abu Eain and implicates Abu Eain as an accomplice. Abu Eain contends Yasin's statement should not be considered because: (1) Yasin's statement is that of an accomplice and is therefore inherently unreliable; (2) Yasin's statement is not sufficiently corroborated by other evidence; (3) Yasin later recanted the statement insofar as it inculpates Abu Eain; (4) Yasin's statement was transcribed in Hebrew, rather than Yasin's native Arabic, and Yasin is not familiar with Hebrew; (5) the statement was taken under inherently coercive conditions; and (6) the statement is inherently incredible.

To facilitate discussion of these contentions, Yasin's statement will be summarized, and corroborating evidence will then be related.

According to an affidavit signed by Yasin: On May 11, 1979 Yasin drove from his home on the West Bank to Tiberias with the intention of selecting a location in which later to place a bomb. He was accompanied by his friend Abu Eain, whom he that day had enlisted in Al Fatah and in the Tiberias operation. On May 14, Yasin prepared a bomb with a timing mechanism and, after explaining how to set the mechanism, delivered the bomb to Abu Eain with instructions to place it in a refuse bin in Tiberias. Abu Eain left Yasin's home for Tiberias at 9:00 a.m. with the bomb. He returned at 4:30 p.m., stating that he had placed the bomb in a refuse bin in the center of a public market in Tiberias. The next day, May 15, Yasin met with Abu Eain and told him of news reports of a bomb's explosion in a market place in Tiberias, stating that "the operation has succeeded, that two persons had been killed and 36 injured." Sometime thereafter, upon learning that a comrade had been arrested, Yasin told Abu Eain that they were in danger and that Abu Eain should do nothing until contacted by Yasin. Two days later, Yasin's cousin, Mufida Jaber (Jaber), delivered a letter to Abu Eain. Jaber, later still, informed Yasin that Abu Eain had gone to America via Amman, Jordan.

According to an affidavit signed by Jaber (also claimed to have been recanted insofar as it incriminates Abu Eain): An intermediary gave Jaber a note from Yasin to deliver to Abu Eain. The note stated that named persons had been captured, and that Abu Eain should take care. At the time the note was delivered, Abu Eain asked Jaber where Yasin was. When she replied she did not know, Abu Eain told her he wished to go to America via Amman. She later reported Abu Eain's statement to Yasin.

According to an affidavit of an Israeli police officer in charge of investigating the Tiberias bombing: A time bomb hidden in a refuse bin in the center of a market in Tiberias had exploded on the afternoon of May 14, 1979 killing 2 boys and injuring 36 other people sufficiently to require hospital treatment for each of them.

There is also evidence that on May 20, 1979, six days after the bombing, Abu Eain obtained a visa to enter the United States. On June 14, 1979, having travelled via Jordan, Abu Eain arrived in Chicago, Illinois, where he took up residence with his sister and her husband. On August 17, 1979, when FBI agents went to that residence with a warrant for his arrest, Abu Eain then denied his identity.

Abu Eain's six attacks on the finding of probable cause will next be considered and evaluated.

(1) In response to the assertion that the statement of an accomplice must be deemed unreliable, it is well established that an uncorroborated statement of an accomplice may nevertheless be sufficient to establish probable cause. Indeed, in federal courts even a conviction can be based on uncorroborated accomplice testimony. The credibility of Yasin's statement is enhanced by the fact that it is contrary to his own penal interest; while it incriminates Abu Eain, it also establishes, without in any way mitigating, Yasin's own guilt.

(2) Although sufficient in itself to support a finding of probable cause, Yasin's statement is also corroborated in a number of significant respects. The Israeli investigating officer's statement confirmed that a time bomb placed in a refuse bin in the center of a market in Tiberias had exploded on the afternoon of May 14, 1979 killing 2 and injuring 36. Jaber's statement confirmed that she had delivered a note from Yasin to Abu Eain which stated that named persons had been captured and that Abu Eain should exercise care. Finally, under these circumstances, Abu Eain's flight to America and denial of his identity when first approached by officers in Chicago, although susceptible to innocent explanations, can be viewed as evidence of a consciousness of guilt for purposes of probable cause.

(3) Proffered evidence that both Yasin and Jaber later recanted their original statements insofar as they incriminated Abu Eain, is no more cognizable now than it was in the courts. In upholding the Magistrate's refusal to admit evidence of the alleged recantations, the Court of Appeals stated the well established rule. "An accused in an extradition hearing has no right to contradict the demanding country's proof or to pose

questions of credibility as in an ordinary trial, but only to offer evidence which explains or clarifies that proof." To do otherwise would convert an extradition hearing into a full-scale trial, which it is not intended to be. An extradition proceeding is not a trial of the guilt or innocence of an accused but instead has the character of a preliminary examination in a criminal proceeding. Applying this rule, the Court of Appeals held: "The later statements (of Yasin and Jaber) do not explain the government's evidence, rather they tend to contradict or challenge the credibility of the facts implicating petitioner in the bombing. Therefore, the Magistrate properly decided that such a contest should be resolved at trial in Israel. The alleged recantations are matters to be considered at the trial, not the extradition hearing." The considerations underlying the aforementioned rule are as compelling for the Department of State as they are for the courts.

(4) Admittedly, Yasin's first statement (as well as that of Jaber) was transcribed in Hebrew, rather than Yasin's native Arabic. The significance of this fact is nullified in large part by evidence received during the District Court hearing. Such evidence discloses that Judge Shabtay of the Magistrate's Court in Jerusalem questioned both Yasin and Jaber in Arabic, and determined they understood their statements and had made them freely.

(5) While Abu Eain asserts that Yasin's original statement was taken under "inherently coercive circumstances," he admits that Yasin's treatment while detained prior to the confession is "unknown." Indeed, the guarded manner in which this contention is stated—that Yasin's statement was made "apparently without a prior opportunity to consult counsel, family or friend and after an unknown but likely period of weeks of detention"—reveals its own weakness. Moreover, when Yasin allegedly recanted his earlier statement, he did not claim that he had incriminated Abu Eain because he had been coerced in any respect, but rather claimed that he had done so because he thought Abu Eain was safely out of the country.

(6) Finally, the contention that Yasin's original statement is on its face inherently incredible is patently without merit.

THE POLITICAL OFFENSE EXCEPTION

Abu Eain's contention that the crimes charged against him are political offenses—and thus are not crimes for which he can be extradited—was fully considered by the courts. After conducting an extensive hearing on the issue, the federal Magistrate held that the political offense exception was not applicable under the circumstances of this case. The District Court, in denying Abu Eain's petition for writ of habeas corpus, and the Court of Appeals, in affirming the order denying the petition for the writ, expressly agreed with the federal Magistrate's conclusion. The United States Supreme Court, in denying the petition for writ of certiorari, must be deemed to have rejected the claim of the political offense exception.

The standard relied upon by United States courts in determining applicability of the political offense exception is the "political incidence" test. Under that test, a common crime cannot be considered a political offense unless two conditions are first satisfied: the act must have been committed during a political uprising, involving a group of which the accused was a member, and the act must have been "incidental to" that uprising, that is, done in furtherance of or with the intention of assisting it. The placing of a time bomb in a market place with intent to kill civilians cannot be deemed to be "incidental to" a political uprising.

That is and must be the position of the United States. It is hoped that it would be the position of all nations. Anyone contemplating the murder of innocent civilians in a misguided effort to further a political cause must be on notice that he will not be permitted to take refuge under a political offense exception. I do not purport to determine that Abu Eain is in fact such a person. In addressing the issue of whether the political offense exception applies, I now conclude only that the crimes charged—whether or not in fact committed—are not political crimes. While the Department of State is the final arbiter of the question whether a charged crime is within the political offense exception in extradition proceedings, no reason appears in this case why the Department's determination should differ from the judicial determination.

I do not and need not for purposes of extradition make any decision on the question of Abu Eain's guilt or innocence. That determination can be made only by a trial court.

FAIR TRIAL

Concern has been expressed by Abu Eain that he would not receive a fair trial if extradited to Israel. This concern appears to be based in large part on an assumption that he would be tried in a military court for security offenses.

We are now satisfied that this assumption is without basis. We have been formally assured by the Government of Israel that the crimes charged against Abu Eain—murder, attempted murder and causing bodily harm with aggravating intent—are common criminal charges which will be tried in an ordinary civilian court; that the conditions of Abu Eain's confinement pending trial and the place of his detention will be the same as in the case of any other civilian detainee accused of similar crimes; that he will be entitled to a speedy, public trial and to counsel of his choice; that he will be entitled to confidential interviews with his attorney on any workday during regular hours; that he will be entitled to weekly visits with family members and other persons; that normal rules of criminal procedure and evidence will prevail; and that the burden will be on the prosecution to establish guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. If convicted, Abu Eain would have the right to appeal the decision to the Israeli Supreme Court. Finally, the charges against Abu Eain do not subject him to the possibility of the death penalty. Abu Eain has stated that if he "could be assured of a just trial in an open system, [he] would have nothing to fear." I believe he has those assurances.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I cannot agree with Abu Eain's contentions that there is a lack of probable cause when prevailing law requires that I give consideration to the Yasin statement. Nor can I agree for reasons stated that the crimes charged are within the political offense exception or that Abu Eain will not receive a just and fair trial within a judicial system not unlike our own systems. I thus conclude that compelling law, including our treaty with Israel, requires that I sign the surrender warrant, and I have done so this date.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my explanation, and I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, our dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), for purposes of debate only.

☐ 1345

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to associate myself with the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) and to indicate my support for the motion to table which will be offered at the conclusion of this debate.

The resolution, that is the subject of this motion, was jointly referred to the Foreign Affairs and Judiciary Committees and I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ZABLOCKI, for the prompt and thorough attention given to it by his committee.

His committee held 1 day of hearings this week on the resolution and based on the testimony presented by the Departments of State and Justice, which I have reviewed, and the information and documents submitted by the Department of State, which have also been reviewed, I share the gentleman's view that the executive branch is in substantial compliance with the request made in the resolution of inquiry.

For this reason, I will support the gentleman's motion to table House Resolution 300 and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The resolution pertains strictly to documents in the possession of the Secretary of State, and I believe that the Committee on Foreign Affairs fully discharged its obligation to examine this matter.

I might point out that the Justice Department did inform us that they had not been the repository of any documents or any independent information in this matter.

Therefore, I decided that the Judiciary Committee would not be required to hold any hearings and I felt that the hearing that was conducted by the Foreign Affairs Committee was sufficient.

I would state that, in keeping with the kind of responsibility that falls on the committees to which resolutions of inquiry are referred, I fully share the view of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and that of his committee that the executive branch has made a good faith effort to comply with the request made in the resolution of inquiry and, as a result, it should be tabled.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Ziad Abu Eain was extradited to Israel after an extensive judicial proceeding in this country. A U.S. magistrate found him extraditable. His finding was reaffirmed by a U.S. district court judge and upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. The U.S. Supreme Court was also petitioned, but after considering full briefs on the issue denied the request for certiorari.

Deputy Secretary Clark, then in that capacity, a man of experience on the bench and of reputation for fairness, made the final decision on granting extradition to this man.

I hope and I expect that after these exhaustive judicial proceedings in this country the Government of Israel, which shares our democratic and judicial tradition, will assure this gentleman a fair trial. There have been deep concerns here about the way in which evidence has been gathered against him.

The confession, signed by another party implicating him, was written in Hebrew, a language that the Palestinian who signed it neither speaks nor understands; and it has since been recanted in writing by the person who made it.

However, Israel has assured the United States that Abu Eain will be tried in a civilian, not a military court, and that he will receive a fair trial. This is very important. The crimes of which he has been accused are extremely serious—killing two youths in a marketplace. We want to know that he will receive a fair trial. The great interest in this case is obvious evidence that many in the United States will be watching to make sure that this does actually occur.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no further requests for time.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS).

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman. I rise, really, for two reasons. I was not aware that this resolution would be presented until this morning at a Whip meeting. Therefore, I did not have time to do the type of research or checking on the background of what brings this resolution to the floor today. Nevertheless, I have great respect for the gentleman from Wisconsin and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan, and I would, therefore, hope in the next few minutes to ask a few questions concerning the resolution; but prior to doing so, I would simply like to comment on the observations made by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

The fact that an individual has been charged with extremely serious crimes involving terrorism and involving the killing of innocent civilians, and the fact that there is enough evidence involved that the judicial processes of the United States have resulted in the extradition of that individual would seem to me to be something that is quite important.

We cannot have a double standard when it comes to terrorism. Terrorism and the killing of a civilian innocent population is not an act that we can in any way condone.

Therefore, the actions which have been taken by out Government in this matter, I think, are altogether consistent with out policies, and I am glad they are.

The second point is that based on all of the information I have received, the likelihood of an individual, any individual, receiving a fair trial in the judicial system of the State of Israel is very, very likely. There are a number of countries in the world, including some of Israel's neighbors, where I would have great question whether an individual charged with a similar crime would, in fact, receive a fair trial; but the democratic institutions of the State of Israel, its respect for law, the evidence in the past where the Israeli judicial system has overruled decisions made by the Government on political issues, indicates to me that we have every assurance in the world that this individual will receive a fair trial.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LEVITAS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. I have listened carefully to what the gentleman has said and I find nothing in his comments with which I disagree. In fact, I concur completely in them.

I think my remarks would tend to establish the same points he has made.

There is apprehension in this country, primarily from Arab-American sources, about this case; but I myself have confidence that the judicial process in Israel will measure up to our expectations and hopes and standards. That is why I take the same position the gentleman does.

Mr. LEVITAS. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois. I am sure he listened carefully to my comments and realizes I was not in any way questioning or disagreeing with him.

I simply wanted to emphasize the point, because of the nature of his resolution, and that brings me very briefly to the last aspect of my request for some time. It has to do, and I apologize for missing the opening remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, because I was on the way over to the floor at the time.

But I would imagine that a resolution of inquiry into an extradition matter is a somewhat unusual, possibly even a unique action by this body. I was wondering if the gentleman, at the risk of perhaps repeating himself, just briefly could explain what is the nature of this extradition that would cause this House to want to engage in this rather unusual procedure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, this resolution, indeed, does not deal with the subsequent action that has been taken as far as the extradition. The resolution requires of the Secretary of State certain documents in the possession of the Secretary of State, and as I have advised the House and my colleagues, that the Foreign Affairs Committee did, indeed, receive these documents and is satisfied that the resolution of inquiry was satisfied. Nevertheless, by prior arrangement and understanding, the cosponsors have agreed that the resolution of inquiry, House Joint Resolution 300, both committees to whom the resolution was referred would discharge the resolution and I would move to table the resolution.

Mr. LEVITAS. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for that explanation. I am most pleased to realize that my expectations, even without knowing in advance the facts, have been fully confirmed by the fairness and the impartiality and the good judgment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I thank him for his explanation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CROCKETT).

Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee for yielding that time.

As one of the sponsors of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I want also to express my appreciation to the chairman and to my fellow members of the committee for the very frank, open, and extended hearing that the committee gave on this resolution.

The purpose of the resolution was to suggest to the Congress that there were certain developments in this particular extradition case that warranted a closer look by the Congress itself, either preliminarily to exercising some form of recommendation to the Secretary of State, who had the ultimate authority to decide on extradition, or certainly to determine what, if any, amendments needed to be made to our laws with respect to extradition.

I can say and I can concur with the chairman that the State Department perhaps in anticipation of what we were requesting came to the hearing and brought the documents. Those that they did not bring they have agreed with the chairman that they will submit.

Meanwhile, however, the extraditee has already been shipped back to Israel. I think it would strain imagination to think that this Government is going to ask Israel to return him here, or that if they did ask, that Israel would return him. In other words, I think we are confronted with a fait accompli.

I therefore see no reason whatever in continuing debate on this question and I concur in the chairman's motion to table.

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to table this resolution. The State Department has complied with the request for information contained in this resolution of inquiry. Accordingly this resolution is moot.

Still I must say that I am perplexed by the concern of some of our colleagues over Abu Eain. They object to his extradition on the grounds that the act, of which he is charged, is a political, not a criminal, act.

They are wrong, dead wrong. Abu Eain is accused of an act of terrorism in Tiberias, Israel, in which two young boys were killed. There is little dispute about the facts of the case. The dispute is over the nature of the act. Is it criminal terrorism or is it a form of political expression?

Today, the day on which General Dozier was freed from the clutches of his terrorist captors in Italy, is a good day to redouble our determination to confront the menace of terrorism. It is a peculiarly inappropriate day to find excuses for it. Terrorism is criminal. It is that simple.

I am glad that Secretary Haig has chosen to deal with the terrorist question and I applaud his decision to extradite Abu Eain.

I submit an article on the Abu Eain case from the New Republic of December 16.

[From the New Republic, Dec. 16, 1981]

TESTING HAIG'S RESOLVE AGAINST TERRORISTS—THE CASE OF ABU EAIN

Within the next few weeks Alexander Haig must make a decision that will have far-reaching implications for American policy on terrorism. He will pass final judgment on whether a 22-year-old former West Bank resident and PLO member, Ziad Abu Eain, should be extradited to Israel, as the U.S. courts have repeatedly affirmed. It is a decision he will have to make in the face of a huge pressure campaign, by the highest level Arab representatives in the U.S., to persuade the State Department not to banish Eain.

There is no dispute about the basic facts of the case. On May 14, 1979, a terrorist's bomb exploded in the crowded marketplace of Tiberias, where young Israelis were gathering to celebrate the 31st anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. Two young boys were killed, and 30 or more people maimed and injured. Shortly thereafter, Abu Eain fled from Ramallah, his West Bank home, to Jordan, and from there to Chicago, where his sister lived. Acting on information from the Israelis, FBI agents visited Eain in Chicago. He lied about his identity, passing himself off with the name "Kamal Yusuf." Returning to arrest Eain, after they learned that the finger prints of "Yusuf" matched those of Eain, the agents discovered that he had fled. But Eain's brother-in-law soon revealed his whereabouts, and the FBI took Eain into custody. On their first visit, one of the agents had mistakenly believed it was Jordan which sought to extradite Eain; this time Eain told the agents, "It's the Israelis, not the Jordanians that want me."

The Israelis did want Eain. They charged he had set the bomb in the market. Their evidence was the testimony provided by another member of Al Fatah, Jamil Yasin, who had prepared the explosive charge and had accompanied Eain on a trip to Tiberias to find a place to leave it. The Israelis also had the sworn testimony of Yasin's cousin, Mufida Jaber, who acknowledged that she carried a letter from Yasin to Abu Eain, warning him that some of their collaborators had been arrested and that the Israeli authorities might be on his trail. Eain promptly left for the U.S.

With Eain in custody, U.S. Attorney Thomas P. Sullivan began preparing the case for extradition. In doing so, he took an unprecedented step whose ramifications were to be felt far beyond the Eain case. Mindful that "politically motivated" acts are not included in the list of extraditable offenses in the U.S., and mindful, in particular, that an IRA terrorist called McMullen, who is wanted by the United Kingdom for bombing a barrack and killing a charwoman, had recently avoided extradition by arguing that his offense was of a "political character," Sullivan called on the State Department.

The State Department sent Louis Fields, legal adviser for State's Office of Combating Terrorism, as its witness at Eain's extradition hearings. He testified that Eain's offense was a common crime of murder committed against civilians, not a political act. Numerous witnesses appeared on Eain's behalf, including Alexandra Johnson, the former vice consul at the U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem, whose reports about torture in Israel were promptly discredited; and Terry Fleeney, who had served time in Israel for abetting terrorists. Johnson and Fleeney were there to provide testimony that the Israelis routinely tortured Palestinian prisoners. Presiding Magistrate Olga Jurco ruled their observations irrelevant to the case at hand. To contribute a historical perspective, the defense called on Elmer Berger, a rabbi associated with the moribund American Council for Judasim and renowned for his enmity to the very idea of a Jewish state. Berger instructed the court on the history of Zionism—i.e., that it is anti-American, anti-Jewish, anti-universal. Magistrate Jurco ruled, historical perspectives notwithstanding, that Eain be extradited on the grounds that the government had proved probable cause to sustain the charges against him, and that his crime could not be considered a political act. This decision was upheld on March 28, 1980, by U.S. District Court Judge Frank McGarr.

The struggle to prevent the Israelis from bringing Eain to trial had become, and it continues to be a cause célèbre. From the beginning, Eain's legal battle attracted a number of luminaries whose names rank high in the radical left pantheon: Noam Chomsky, Daniel Berrigan, Sidney Lens, David Dellinger. Others who rose to Eain's defense were Frances Fitzgerald, William Sloane Coffin Jr., and I. F. Stone. Did they really know the facts of his case? What had rendered the Eain case worthy of their attentions—its central and significant fact—was that Eain was a Palestinian. He was thus, they argued, a victim rather than the perpetrator of a crime: a victim of Zionism and of Zionist pressures. So, if I. F. Stone speaks for the accused killer, who speaks for the two dead boys? Eain's allies contended that it was torture by the Israelis that had extracted the testimony of Eain's Al Fatah comrade, Yasin. It remained for Ramsey Clark, who made the same claims about Israeli torture in arguing Eain's legal appeal, to voice the political premises underlying all the concerns with civil rights and lack of due process raised by Eain's defenders: "One person's terrorist," Clark told the court, "is another person's freedom fighter."

Judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit heard Ramsey Clark argue that at the time of the bombing Eain was far away in Ramallah, attending the birth of a relative's child. Clark said that 12 of Eain's relatives were prepared to bear witness to this statement, that those accomplices who had testified against Eain had recanted, and that in any case such testimony could only have been obtained under torture by the Israelis. Clark's argument echoed, if somewhat more delicately, the claims of Abu Eain's defense committee that the U.S. courts had been influenced by "Zionist pressures." "We love the Jewish people," Clark told the court. "This bomb went off on the eve of the celebration of Israel's independence. . . . We can't let our biases sway us." The bombing itself, in which explosives had been set in a marketplace crowded with children preparing for a celebration, was, the former U.S. Attorney General explained, "a relatively political act." In arguing the case for the government, U.S. Attorney Thomas P. Sullivan reminded the court that the bombing being described thus had resulted in the murder of two young boys.

On February 20, 1981, Judges Wilbur F. Pell Jr., Harlington Wood Jr., and Byron G. Skelton rendered their decision, affirming the lower court's order that Eain be extradited. Harlington Wood Jr. wrote in the opinion that the strong evidence established by the government proved probable cause to believe the defendant had committed the crime for which the Israelis wished to try him. Not only had Eain's accomplice testified to Eain's role in the bombing, but he had incriminated himself as well. And there was Eain's behavior to corroborate the accomplice's testimony: he had fled to Chicago, lied about his identity, fled again when the FBI sought him, and knew that it was the Israelis who wanted him and not, as the FBI agents at first mistakenly thought, the Jordanians.

The most significant aspect of what is sure to be a landmark opinion lies in its assessment of the political offense argument raised by Eain's lawyers to prevent extradition. Judge Wood agreed that the PLO sought the destruction of a civilian populace and that its terrorist activities could be considered a violent political disturbance. The opinion continued:

"If, however, considering the nature of the crime charged, that were all that was necessary in order to prevent extradition under the political offense exception, nothing would prevent an influx of terrorists seeking a safe haven in America. Those terrorists who flee to this country would avoid having to answer to anyone, anywhere, for their crimes. The law is not so utterly absurd. Terrorists who have committed barbarous acts elsewhere would be able to flee to the United States . . . and walk our streets forever free from any accountability for their acts."

Eain's defense exhausted nearly all legal recourses (the Sypreme Court refused to hear the case), and the campaign on behalf of Eain has been stepped up considerably. Representatives of virtually every Arab country have expressed their opinions on the matter in Washington. In the United Nations, Jordan and other Arab countries lashed out at U.S. courts, accusing them of committing a travesty of justice and of depriving Eain of due process of law. The Jordanian Ambassador announced that the attempt to extradite Eain to stand trial in Israel was "an offense of the magnitude of the Holocaust."

The State Department attorney said that in his 2[illegible] years of experience with the legal profession he had never seen more faithful application of due process than that which had been accorded Eain. "They viciously attack our judiciary and our system of justice; and I will sign an oath in blood that this man has been accorded every due process of law that there is to be accorded." Further, the attorney asserted, despite all the propaganda to the contrary, "there can be no doubt that the Israelis will give Eain a fair trial. Their system of justice is very much like our own." In fact, it is not unusual for Israeli courts to acquit Arabs accused of terrorist acts, precisely because Israel's judicial system—laws of evidence, attorney of defendant's own choosing, appeal to judges with habits of independence, etc.—is very much like ours.

In the Eain case the American judicial system for the first time has come to grips with the question of terrorism. It has explicitly recognized the danger of sanctioning terrorist activities masquerading as "political action" and the folly of mistaking terrorists for freedom fighters. The opinion in the Eain case recognized that an act of violence directed at civilians amounted to a common crime of murder and thus acknowledged a distinction that the laws of war have made for some time. It is a great irony that so many influential members of the American left should now try further to erode that distinction so vital to civil society. Will the State Department bow to the pressure being applied on Eain's behalf, or will it support the court's decision and unflinchingly identify acts of terrorism for what they are?●

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table House Resolution 300.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) to lay on the table House Resolution 300.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 300, the resolution just debated today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT JANUARY 30, 1982, BE OBSERVED AS A NATIONAL DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE OF POLAND

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 328) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that January 30, 1982, should be observed as a national day of solidarity with the people of Poland.

The clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, and I do so for the purpose of allowing my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, an opportunity to explain this resolution.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber Tuesday night when President Reagan gave his state of the Union address, his first state of the Union address, he did one thing of great significance for the American people and for the people of Poland in asking the Nation that January 30 be a day of solidarity of the American people with the people of Poland.

□ 1400

This is important, not only for the people of Poland and for the millions of Polish Americans in our country, but for all Americans and all people worldwide who are concerned about freedom and good will. It is in keeping with the bipartisan foreign policy that our former colleague from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, began after the Second World War that I offer this resolution. It simply reiterates the President's statements that

> Our sanctions against the military dictatorship that has attempted to crush human rights in Poland—and against the Soviet regime behind that military dictatorship—clearly demonstrated to the world that America will not conduct "business as usual" with the forces of oppression.

And where further, President Reagan urged all peaceloving peoples to join together on that day to raise their voices and speak and pray for freedom.

Last month in the city of Warren, 6,000 people turned out on a freezing, snowy day, to declare their solidarity with the people of Poland. This Saturday, hundreds of thousands of people around this country, through the sponsorship of the American Polish Congress and the AFL-CIO and many other groups, are sponsoring such solidarity days.

One example will take place in the city of Hamtramck, Mich. A program will be sponsored by the city government and the American Polish Congress to demonstrate this solidarity. I commend my colleagues for supporting and cosponsoring this resolution, and I commend the President of the United States for his strong support of the Polish people and their right for freedom.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend my colleague from Michigan for this timely resolution. The meeting will be held on January 30, 1982. It does have strong bipartisan support. I think it is a very worthwhile resolution. I ask for its approval at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HERTEL)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 328

Whereas on December 13, 1981, the ruling military regime in Poland declared martial law in an effort to crush the civil liberties of the Polish people;

Whereas countless members of the only free Polish trade union have been killed, beaten, or jailed;

Whereas President Reagan, in his state of the Union address of January 26, 1982, stated, "Our sanctions against the military dictatorship that has attempted to crush human rights in Poland, and against the Soviet regime behind that military dictatorship, clearly demonstrated to the world that America will not conduct 'business as usual' with the forces of oppression.";

Whereas numerous groups, including the American Polish Congress and the AFL-CIO, have designated January 30, 1982, a day of solidarity with the people of Poland; and

Whereas President Reagan urged "all peace loving peoples to join together" on that day, "to raise their voices, to speak and pray for freedom": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that January 30, 1982, should be observed by the people of the United States as a national day of solidarity with the people of Poland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HERTEL) is recognized for 1 hour in support of his resolution.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the schedule for the balance of the week and for next week.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I would be very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, for the balance of this week, the House meets at 11 a.m. on Friday, January 29. There will be no legislative business.

The program for the House of Representatives for the week of February 1, 1982, is:

Monday, the House is not in session.

Tuesday, February 2, the House meets at noon to consider the Private Calendar. There are no suspensions.

The House will consider H.R. 4481, Justice Assistance Act of 1981, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

The House meets at 3 p.m. on Wednesday and 11 a.m. the balance of the week.

Any further program will be announced later. The House will adjourn by 3 p.m. on Friday, and 5:30 p.m. on all other days except Wednesday. Conference reports may be brought up at any time. Any further program will be announced later.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. I have just one question for the gentleman.

There is no further program announced for Wednesday and the balance of the week. Does the gentleman at the present time anticipate pro forma sessions throughout the balance of the week?

Mr. MURTHA. We will not know until next Wednesday.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1982

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House convenes on Tuesday next, it convene at noon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1982, TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1982

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, January 29, 1982, it adjourn until Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO A GREAT AMERICAN LEGISLATOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Gephardt) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker and Members, I think it is entirely fitting that on the day we honor a great American President, we also honor a great American legislator.

Some weeks ago, we were all disappointed to learn that Richard Bolling, the chairman of our Rules Committee, is choosing a career change after 34 years of service in the House of Representatives. Trying to analyze the impact our colleague, Dick Bolling, has had on this House is an awesome challenge, indeed. In fact, it may not be possible. His impact is not merely a reflection of the fact that he has been here longer than nearly all of us, although he has, nor does it grow out of his view which has recently gained a lot of popularity that Government must be the efficient servant of the people with an equal emphasis placed both on efficiency and on service.

My suspicion is that Dick Bolling's influence is a natural outgrowth of the wide range of his interests and his skill at communicating them. Historically, many Members have concentrated on the major issues of the day. A smaller group has emphasized the internal and organizational problems that preclude efficient congressional operations. Dick Bolling's genius lies in the fact that he has simultaneously become an effective leader of both groups.

Our current budget process is largely his invention. We have become increasingly aware of its flaws in the past few years, but I know of no one who would deny that it is a significant improvement over the chaos that was previously the norm.

But Dick Bolling has been a thinker as well as a doer. He was one of the first to realize that so-called reform could lead to political paralysis and cripple traditional party activity. This was a provocative assertion coming from someone who began his career by successfully challenging a well oiled political machine, but it proved to have merit.

He has not won all of his battles. No one does. But he has prevailed in a good share of them, and he has often been subsequently proven right by events, despite a loss on a particular issue.

It may be that few Americans realize the impact that Dick Bolling has had on all of our lives. But I am confident that all of my colleagues here are aware of it. Beyond that, I owe him a personal debt that I will never be able to fully repay.

When I first came to Washington, Dick Bolling generously shared the advice that was distilled from decades of experience here. In a way, I felt like I was standing on his shoulders as I scanned the scene here. He was equally generous with the influence he had amassed.

One major reason my service in this House has been so fulfilling is the initial interest Dick Bolling took in me, and I know that I am not unique in this regard.

So I begin this special order today with a sadness that this is Dick Bolling's last year in the Congress, and a gladness that his role here is being recognized by all of us who will miss him here. Because of Dick Bolling's service in Congress, our political institutions are more responsive, and our Nation is healthier. He has been quick to criticize, but he has been equally strong in arguing that politics is an honorable profession, and that we all share a common goal—serving the people. Or, as he put it in one of his books, and I quote:

> The political leader is vastly different from that of a philosopher, political theorist or anyone who tries to analyze social problems and develop proposed solutions. All of these can and should be purists, seeking the ideal solution. The political leader's role is to achieve an effective solution.

He has constantly prodded us to adopt such solutions and he has often succeeded. He has had a proud history in this House, and has helped all of us to do our jobs better. I think each one of us wishes him a happy and healthy future, and we feel assured that he will continue to contribute his wisdom, his energy and his experience to the United States of America.

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Michigan (Mr. Bonior.)

Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I took some comfort on my last birthday in reminding myself that Chairman Bolling was already serving in the House when I was 3 years old. When I noticed that he was back in the office within 3 weeks of his open heart surgery, however, I was forced to rethink that comparison.

When I arrived in the Congress in 1977, Dick Bolling was one of the first Members to earn my respect because of his hard work and intricate knowledge of the House. Having had the opportunity to work under his leadership on the Rules Committee, I have witnessed another dimension to his character: his abiding sense of fairness.

During the partisan debates of last year, even his most ardent adversaries must have respected that attribute. That is not to say that Dick Bolling is not partisan—he is deeply committed to the Democratic Party and its principles. But his fairness is driven by an insuperable respect for the institution of the House and the form of government from whence its power derives. Even when others in this body were doing violence to the traditions and principles of the House, he remained committed to orderly, open, and dignified deliberations and at times it may have worked to his short-term disadvantage.

His many accomplishments testify to his value to his constituents and his country. However, it is the example of this deep respect for the House as an institution that he leaves as a special gift to those of us that labor in its Chambers.

Those who opt for the expediency of opportunism at the expense of principle, for short-term success over prudent deliberacy, for exploitation over fairness are either remembered in infamy or are remembered not at all. Those who strive for the strengthening of the democratic process regardless of the temporary vicissitudes of politics are remembered in the regretfully brief list of statesmen. I am confident that it is to this latter group that history will assign Richard Bolling. We thank him for his leadership and wish him the best in "life after Congress."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I am pleased to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas.

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I was privileged, as were other Members who assembled here in the joint session with the other body to honor a late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for the leadership that he provided this Nation.

□ 1415

Today we honor a man for the leadership he has provided the House of Representatives, Richard Bolling of Missouri. He is my neighbor, as a resident of Missouri, and he is my friend and adviser.

As a new Member to this body, some 14 years ago, I quickly decided those persons on whom I could depend during difficult times in serving in this body. I turned to Dick Bolling for his knowledge of the complex mechanism that permits an institution of 435 Members to function and to operate, which is in itself an achievement in democracy. He is known by all of us as an individual who respects his institution and who has a sense of purpose about the direction in which it should proceed.

Richard Bolling, in my view, is one of the giants that have served in this Congress. There are others that I have known, such as Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, who is referred to in our own State as "the last of the Titans." I think that, as the institution has changed and the kinds of people who come here have changed, Richard Bolling will be remember as one who has provided leadership and direction during times of change to all of us who needed that leadership, that knowledge, that direction, and that sense of purpose.

I am saddened that he is leaving. I was surprised by his announcement that he would not seek reelection, but I am as confident as other Members of this body are that we will still be able to rely upon Richard Bolling for the kind of leadership and advice that he has given all of us in the past, because I feel certain that he will write and that he will share his wisdom and his sense of purpose with all of us. I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Brown).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am moved to speak in part by the words that the gentleman in the well himself expressed. I am not deeply touched by Mr. Bolling's departure. I think he has been here long enough, probably. I feel that way about myself, of course. But, the gentleman in the well referred to the fact that when he first arrived here, he felt that he was standing on Mr. Bolling's shoulders, and the previous speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, referred to him as a giant. There is an interesting history of this terminology. The great scientist, Sir Isaac Newton, was once being complimented on his great contribution—and he is truly one of the probably three or four great scientific leaders that the world has produced—and in all modesty he said that he was not entitled to the credit that was being bestowed upon him because he himself stood upon the shoulders of giants.

That is an appropriate term to use for Richard Bolling. He is one of the giants on whose shoulders I have stood and you have stood and many others, and because he is a modest man, I am sure he would give credit to the other great leaders upon whose shoulders he has stood. But you do not stand on the shoulders of pygmies; you stand on the shoulders of giants, and the important thing is that there have to be giants who are sufficiently concerned with both the people and the future, whose concerns span a broad spectrum of the concerns of our society in order that they may learn from the past and transmit to the future the wisdom that is necessary to solve the problems of the day.

Though I have never been very close to Mr. Bolling—he is rather obnoxious when you get to know him—I have benefited from that knowledge, from that contact, and as the gentleman has indicated, in more cases than not, I have found that he had a wisdom beneath that gruff exterior which overshadowed his faults. I am proud to pay tribute to this contribution.

I say that I have no particular sense of regret because I really expect his contributions in the future toward solving the problems that face us will be even greater than they have been in the past, and I look forward with anticipation to that. I hope to benefit from it, because I know that he will not be restrained in what he says. I know that he will distill the essence of what he has learned from these years here, and make it available to an even broader audience. I think the country as a whole can be happy and proud that this is the situation. I pay tribute to a great man.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Zablocki).

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, at the very outset, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri for taking this time and making it possible for us to pay tribute to a great American. I consider it a real privilege to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the long and honorable public career of Dick Bolling as we begin the last year in which he will be serving in this body—as always with great distinction.

Dick Bolling and I were first elected to the House in the same year, 1948, and consequently, our association is one of long standing. Perhaps, however, I should note for the record that, like President Reagan, neither one of us were present during the administration of George Washington.

In any case, those of us who have worked with the gentleman from Missouri, Dick Bolling, for as many years as I have, recognize his strong leadership, his great intelligence, and above all, his enduring commitment to the ideals which have guided him in his outstanding service to this body and to the Nation.

These are the qualities, moreover, that have distinguished his chairmanship of the Rules Committee in the 96th and 97th Congresses. They also characterize his service on the Joint Economic Committee, and during the 1950's, on the Banking Committee.

These characteristics also were in evidence in his, shall I say, private or political life. I recall earlier in our careers, when we were just young freshman, Dick Bolling had agreed to come to our community of Milwaukee—and I say "ours," because at that time we had another colleague, Congressman Andrew Biemiller, who represented the fifth District of Wisconsin. It was upon his invitation that Dick Bolling came to Milwaukee to attend a picnic. Just to attend a picnic of a political nature takes courage, especially in Milwaukee.

I am not sure whether Dick Bolling remembers this. Somehow he got to Milwaukee although I am not sure how. In those days, air travel was not as convenient as it is today and Milwaukee was not that accessible from Missouri. Nevertheless, along around 7:30 on Sunday morning, I got a call from Dick Bolling advising me that he was in town. I went over to pick him up. He must have traveled all night to get there because he was really very tired.

So, I said to Dick, "Would you rather have breakfast or would you rather have a nap?"

I knew he needed a nap more. He agreed—"Well, I will stretch out a bit."

I decided to prepare breakfast since my wife was not home. I fried bacon—Cudahey bacon, made in Milwaukee, by the way—and eggs. I made a pot of fresh coffee, and I just got this coffee to where the aroma was best when into the kitchen walked Dick Bolling. He said, "I am not as tired as I thought I was. I will have that breakfast now."

I must confess that that was the first time I tested out my culinary art on a colleague. Fortunately, he survived.

Seriously, though, let me say that, in my judgment, his most lasting contribution to the proceedings of this body was his role as chairman of the Select Committee on Committees in 1973, which produced the set of bipartisan recommendations on the organization and structure of our House committees, which was of major, and I believe, of historic significance.

The great State of Missouri has been called the "show me" State, and Dick Bolling has shown all of us that national elective office can be a honorable and rewarding profession. His incisive wit, his idealism, and his widsom will be missed in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, since time does not permit me to list all of Mr. Bolling's major accomplishments, I merely want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman for his contribution to the work of the House, and to offer him and his family a happy and richly deserved retirement. We will miss you, Dick.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Michel).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with so many others in honoring our good friend and distinguished colleague, Dick Bolling, who has announced his retirement at the end of this year.

Throughout the years, there have not been many major issues on which Dick and I have agreed. I am sure Dick has often wondered how Bob Michel could reach the political conclusions I have. And I can tell you the same thought has passed through my mind about him.

But the fact of the matter is that while Dick Bolling and I have disagreed on politics, we have never disagreed as to the basic principles underlying debate and orderly procedure in this House.

Dick Bolling is truly a "man of the House." He loves this institution. He not only abides by its rules but lives and acts by them in the way he conducts himself in committee, on the floor, in debate, and wherever he has been called upon to preside over this House.

As is well known, Dick has been in the forefront of those who seek to make this great institution work a little better.

He is, and has been, a champion of those who sought to streamline jurisdictional matters among our committees. I am glad to say I cosponsored his legislation for a "Little Hoover Commission" for more effective Government.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, while Dick Bolling and I have disagreed when it comes to issues, we are in perfect agreement when it comes to the need to make our system work better for the people.

As a Republican, I guess I ought to say I am glad to see the Democrats lose the services of such a tough and talented antagonist. But as an American, I have to say that this place is not going to be the same without Dick Bolling's forthright, direct, no-nonsense style.

And on a much more personal note, I am proud to have had the privilege to serve with Dick Bolling for so many years and to have my life enriched by that association.

My best wishes go out to him in whatever course he chooses to pursue in his retirement from this body.

☐ 1430

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Fuqua).

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take the opportunity today arranged by Congressman Gephardt, to honor an outstanding leader, Dick Bolling, whose distinguished career in the House is unsurpassed. His vision, hard work, and intellect will be greatly missed, but the legislative handiwork which bears his stamp, and the basic fairness embodied in the House rules he helped to craft will serve us well for future years. Since men are often best remembered for the institutions they create, it is very correct to say that the House of Representatives and the Congress is the institution it now is, in large measure, because of his never ending pursuit of democratic principles and procedures to serve it. He has also indeed had an exceptional influence on the development of the Democratic Party, both as a team player on the Rules Committee and as a student of the Congress.

Dick Bolling is a man who likes to take on the tough issues. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 serves as an early example of this principle. Many of us now in this Chamber were just getting started in politics in those days, and it is with great admiration that I recall how truly enormous was the effort it took to enact national legislation of such stature in those days.

Another tough issue was committee reform, and the opening of the process to every Member, sometimes at the expense of those who had already achieved an important position. Some early chapters on the "Bolling Committee," as we call it, and its work to modernize the House and bring the work of its several committees into better balance have already been written. The Committee on Science and Technology which I am privileged to chair is one of the many beneficiaries of the painstaking efforts led by Dick Bolling. As a result of his efforts the House did give responsibility for civilian research and development to one committee and thus equipped itself to deal with one of the key issues on our national agenda: The role of science and technology, and the contributions which can be made by that sector to increased innovation and productivity. In addition, as a key figure on the Rules Committee for many years and more recently as its chairman, he has been instrumental in seeing that the referral mechanisms put in place by House Resolution 988 were properly and fairly adhered to. The product of this stewardship has been better legislation, and it would not have been possible without Dick Bolling.

Equally tough to grapple with has been the tying together in the Congress of the spending side with the requirement to levy taxes. The 1974 Budget and Improvement Control Act bears his stamp and is in large measure the product of his foresight. Since the implementation of the act is still a matter of relative newness the full impact of the goals and procedures it establishes is very much in the center of today's political arena. The linkage of spending authority and taxing authority had changed the whole nature of our political debate and given national attention to the very essential work we do here and its impact on our economy. Dick Bolling is a liberal who believes in fiscal responsibility—to me that sums it up.

I also admire Dick Bolling very much for his labors as an author, as a student of the Congress, and because of his seeming fascination with macroeconomics, nurtured by years of service on the Joint Economic Committee. His most recent book, "America's Competitive Edge" deals with the very subject of such great concern to me and to the Science and Technology Committee, and illustrates yet again the breadth and depth of his intellect. The book offers a definite program to bring about the renewal of America's economic strength and displays an impressive grasp of the key role for science and technology.

Dick Bolling has unselfishly served in the finest tradition, his constituents and his institution. We will miss him.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Rhodes).

Mr. RHODES. I thank my good friend from Missouri (Mr. Gephardt) for yielding. I am pleased to take a moment and join my colleagues in paying tribute to a very good personal friend, Dick Bolling, and to thank him for his many years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives.

Dick has been here about 33 years and he has lent his abundant talents to setting some of the Nation's most momentus issues. His tactical skill and thorough understanding of the workings of this House has made him one of the most formidable legislators and debators to have ever labored in this Chamber. Many are the battles in which I would like to have had Dick's knowledge and skill on my side. But, you know, in some of them we did fight side by side and we have shared many of the same ideas in the field of congressional reform.

As has been said before, he has had many fine hours. But I think his finest hour was as chairman of the Committee on Congressional Reform some years ago which brought forth, I thought, a really momentous report, and one which I tried, as did many others, to have adopted. I cannot help but believe that the work of the House would have certainly been enhanced insofar as not only quality but speed of enactment is concerned had we been able to triumph.

I believe Dick Bolling has probably had as much influence on the House as any contemporary Member, and I know his absence will be felt acutely when he retires at the end of this session. But as one who has made a similar decision and will be leaving the Congress with him, I am just as certain that he will continue his notable contribution to the art of government as I hope to do through lecturing and writing.

I could go on and on with laudatory remarks about this remarkable man but if I say too much he might lose some of the esteem of his Democratic colleagues. I suspect that he did when I lauded him in a little book which I wrote a few years ago and did not treat some of his colleagues with equal kindness. I hope he has recovered from that and I assure him that what I said at that time I feel just as strongly as I did then.

One of the nicest things that has happened to me after I got out of the minority leadership was to be able to serve on the great Committee on Rules and to serve under the chairmanship of Dick Bolling. He has an absolute fascination for the rules of this House. I might say he is also intrigued by some of the things that one can do to them every now and then and, in fact, he has taught a few of us some tricks which I am sure will live either in fame or infamy but, nevertheless, they will live.

One of the things which I would regret if I were staying is that Dick would not be here. But I cannot say that.

But I do want to thank him again and I guess thank the good Lord, too, for the service of people like Dick Bolling in this great Republic of ours.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his find statement.

I now yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Panetta).

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding and am pleased to join in the tribute of my colleagues to this distinguished individual. He is truly a giant of this institution and it is appropriate that we honor him on the same day we pay tribute to another giant of our times.

The House is an interesting institution and the Members of the House have many different qualities that sometimes we admire and other qualities that we do not admire. The qualities of honesty, integrity, knowledge, are qualities we admire. The qualities of those who are perhaps coarse or direct or at times obnoxious we do not admire.

Dick Bolling is someone who possesses all of those qualities. But that is not what Dick will be remembered for.

There are two key qualities that I think are extremely important to what Dick Bolling is all about. One has already been mentioned here. It is the respect for the institution. There surely is no other Member who holds the kind of respect for this institution that Dick Bolling has or who has contributed to keeping this institution a vital part of our democracy. That is really what he is about and that is what he will be remembered for, his dedication to the institution.

During the time we were having many meetings on reconciliation and the budget process generally, Dick Bolling constantly asked the question: "What does this mean in terms of the process? What does this mean in terms of the institution?"

Because of those questions we were able to keep that process on track with the institution and with its goals.

Dick Bolling is an anchor. He is an anchor for the institution and he is an anchor for our system of government.

There is another quality that has not been mentioned here that I think is just as important. Dick Bolling is also a revolutionary in the best sense of the word. Yes, he has a respect for the institution, but he also understands that the institution is not static, that it must be vibrant, that it must look to new ideas, that it must look to changes in our system. If our society is changing, if our needs are changing, then the institution has to respond to those needs. He is not so stuck in the mud in terms of the institution that he is not willing to consider those ideas.

It is for that reason that I think younger Members like myself and Dick and others have really appreciated his presence because he is not only important in terms of the institution but he respects new ideas and he wants to listen.

So it is those two qualities, respect for the institution and the revolutionary quality to listen to new ideas and to be able to modify this institution to respect those new ideas that I think Dick Bolling will be remembered.

He will always, whether he is here or whether he is outside of this body, he will always be an anchor for this institution and he will also be an anchor for those new Members who come into this body and want to share in those qualities that he will leave with us for a long time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I yield to my friend from Missouri (Mr. Coleman).

Mr. COLEMAN. I thank my colleague for yielding and would like to rise and also pay tribute to the gentleman who shares with me the distinction of representing the city of Kansas City, Mo., in the U.S. Congress.

Richard Bolling is not only our senior Member from Kansas City, he is the senior member of the Missouri delegation, the dean of our delegation. His continuity and his oversight and views of what has happened here in the last 33 years has certainly set well with those of us who are new Members of the Congress in the last 5 or 6 years as we understand what preceded us and hopefully what impact we might have on this body as we go forward.

I suppose I am the only person in the House who was a constituent of Dick Bolling. For 21 years Dick Bolling was my Congressman, since the age that I was 5 until I was 26 years of age. In that period of time, which are formative years, I was able to firsthand witness what a Congressman can do. Frankly, it gave me I think some incentive to run for the House one day, not against Dick Bolling but in an adjacent district which I reside in now and have since 1969.

Dick Bolling started constituent services, I think, before it was fashionable or even politically necessary to get reelected. I recall the little things that our Congressman used to do. If your name appeared in the paper, as occasionally it might, he would be sure and let you know that he saw it and he would hand-sign a little note to that effect. A lot of us do that now, but it was not done 20 years ago as it is today.

I recall the things that Kansas City is proud of that Dick Bolling has done for them. I think it is very easy to be a national politician or a national figure and forget exactly where you come from. But Dick Bolling has had the personal touch and he has fought hard for Kansas City.

I remember I believe the 1964 campaign in which Dick's campaign poster was a picture of the Congressman and behind him was the skeleton start of what is not our Federal Regional Office Building in Kansas City. I am sure that Congressman Bolling had a great deal to do with having that regional office there in Kansas City with the hundreds of people who work in that office building and who provide services for many other States and communities but especially for Kansas City.

His personal touch was also there. I know friends of mine, Republican friends, who tell about DICK BOLLING showing up on election morning in a south Kansas City precinct and being able to name off and call by first name his constituents as they come in to vote. That is a very difficult thing to do in a highly urbanized area and one which I think pays tribute to the gentleman to remember the very people who elected him that he has gone back to.

As a college student I applied to my Congressman for a summer internship, as I recall. I did not get it. But I wrote him a letter and told him what a job I thought he was doing and, frankly, I forgot it. I was elected to Congress in 1967 and vistied with DICK BOLLING. Either he has a great storehouse of knowledge or he has a great retrieval system because he remembered the letter that the college student wrote him 15 years earlier and some of the remarks that I had made in it. For whatever reason he remembered, I think it is a personal touch that a Congressman of his stature, who did not need to have that kind of personal touch, frankly, has continued to have.

I remember in 1964 also, as the Congressman does, that he was challenged by the factions of Kansas City, by the vestiges of the old Pendergast machine that ran Kansas City and made it notorious through the years. They went after DICK BOLLING in probably his only really tough reelection. This was not the general election but the primary in the Democratic Party. I was in New York at the time and I remember going down to Times Square to pick up a copy of the newspaper that night to see what happened in the primary in Kansas City. Yes, it was national news and it was in the New York Times because DICK BOLLING is a national figure.

He survived that election. He defeated them soundly and has gone on with virtually very little opposition since in either the general or primary elections.

DICK BOLLING has a broad view of government. He has a broad view of this House as an institution. I hope, and I know I speak for the citizens of Kansas City, that we hope that he will continue to share his views and his life with those of us in our community and that he will continue to play an important role in our community and come back again and tell us his views and his position and give us another history lesson so that we may learn from the past and from his experiences so that we can have a better country in the future.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me and thank him very much.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this special order today.

I think DICK BOLLING leaving this institution means one thing very clearly. We are losing our best man.

I think it is fitting that JOHN RHODES was here earlier because I think JOHN and DICK share one quality in great abundance. They both are institutional men. I think that DICK BOLLING understands and has communicated more effectively and more thoroughly than anyone else in this institution the key role that structure plays in the legislative process and the key role that character plays in the legislative process.

I remember seeking him out after I was elected to this body on April 1, 1969. I remember sitting next to him many, many times when he was seated in the seat in which he is sitting right now, asking him about the institution, asking him about his own view of history, asking him about all of the things that one asks about if they are trying to understand how to function in this place.

☐ 1445

I think there were two ways that he was most helpful to me: No. 1, in understanding or developing a better understanding and a better sense of history; and, second, he also placed great emphasis on the necessity to build coalitions, because without building coalitions you cannot get anything done either in this institution or in this country.

He reminds me very much, in an historical sense, of the person who I believe to be the finest public servant Wisconsin has ever produced. Most people, when they hear that, think that you are talking about Robert LaFollette, Sr. And I am not. I happen to have the view that the most distinguished public servant my State has ever produced was Robert LaFollette, Jr. I think he was one of the progressives who understood the necessity to involve this country internationally at a time when many people of his political stripe did not have that understanding. He also understood the need for change in the legislative bodies, to make them move with the times. I think that DICK reflects both of those understandings as clearly as anyone I know.

I know that some people from time-to-time have thought that DICK BOLLING was perhaps a touch too acerbic for his own good and for the good of the institution. I very much disagree with that. I think that this institution, like many others, needs a little acid to cut through the phoniness and to cut through the irrelevancies which we see here and in any other institution from time-to-time, just as it needs a little balm to heal over differences which occur when people hold strongly held views.

I think, without a doubt, he is the greatest Member of Congress I have ever served with. He is certainly, in historical terms, the greatest Member of this House in modern history who never became Speaker. I voted for him for majority leader, and the reason I voted for him was because I thought he belonged to a type that we badly need in this institution. There are really two kinds of people: somebody who wants the job because they want the title, and somebody who wants the title so that they can do the job. And DICK BOLLING falls in that latter category. I think that, more than any other reason, is why so many people have had such great respect for him through the years.

I think all of us, more than anything else, want at the end of our career to have it said of us that we made a difference. And more than any other individual I have ever known in this institution, DICK BOLLING has made a difference. He has made a difference on issues ranging from the organization of this place itself to the great moral issue of our time, the civil rights issue. He certainly has a sense of compassion which has moved this institution on a whole range of issues that made this country better for the people we represent. He has recognized that the job of a Member of Congress is really threefold: You have to be a legislator, you have to be a service agent for your district, and you also have to be a public educator. I think many times that last quality is the most important. Again, I know of no Member of the House who has done a better job on that crucial task of educating not only the public but our own colleagues than has DICK BOLLING. He has been a friend to me. He has been a leader for me. He has been a stern taskmaster for all of us. I think all of us are the better for it. It is fitting, as the gentleman from California indicated, that we discuss his career here on the same day that we pay tribute to the man who, in my judgment, is the third greatest man that this country has ever had, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

While I do not remember the quotation exactly, I think DICK's whole approach to public service recognizes that he did take to heart F. D. R.'s admonition, if I can characterize it rather than quote it, that says "Better the government which commits an occasional sin in the name of its concern for people than the sins of omission committed by a government frozen in the ice of its own indifference." I think DICK BOLLING's whole career indicates that, above all, he is not indifferent, not to the institution, not to the country and, most certainly, not to the individuals for whom the country was created.

We are losing our best man. I very much regret it, on both a professional and personal level. I do know that he still has much to contribute to the country, and I consider it the greatest privilege of my life to have served with him.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. Conable).

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, for holding this special order, giving us the opportunity that we have today. I frequently shrink from such an opportunity, for fear of sounding trite. If there is anybody who is entitled to more than the usual trite expressions of respect that are frequent here at retirement, it is Dick Bolling. This institution depends very strongly for its vitality on the frequent infusion of new ideas. But the House also depends on the cement that can keep that dynamic ideas from tearing us apart. And the cement that holds this institution together is usually respect. Over his service here Dick Bolling has contributed a great deal to the new ideas which enliven this institution, and he has also been an important part of this cement of respect.

We are all aware of his understanding of the process, his love of it, his inquiring mind and his directness in trying to put his ideas into effect. So his contributions to the vitality of this institution, I think, are signal.

Also, however, the cement that he has provided has been an awfully important part of the intensity and cohesion of this institution. We are by nature transients. There are comparatively few of us who stay as long as Dick Bolling has stayed. During his entire service here he has been a central figure, not because of the positions he has held—although he has held important positions—but because of his personality and his character and the strength of his intellect. As a central figure, he has been widely respected, even by those who have disagreed with him, and they have never had any doubt of their disagreement because Dick has never compromised his views in ways that would leave people uncertain as to where he stands.

In addition to the personal respect with which he is held, his respect for the institution has also been an important part of the cement. His love of the House, the extent to which he is the prototype of the best in House membership has been an example for many others. Without such an example, we can acquire institutional respect only through long service in this institution. Through the example of people like Dick Bolling we get a quicker sense of the importance of institutional stability, institutional growth, and institutional understanding. His love of the House is infectious and transferable.

I have heard him described as an institutional man. I am sure that he knows as much about the House of Representatives as all the rest of us put together. He is a student of its process. His mind has reached into all of the aspects of our institutional history. In that sense, he is an institutional man. But while those who do not know him may easily think of him as an institution, those who do know him cannot think of him except in warmly human terms. He is not a man who inspires neutrality. The strength of his personality belies any effort to categorize him as just some sort of a fraction of an institution. In a human institution, he is a preeminent human being.

There is a lot to be said about Dick Bolling. We all are going to be diminished by his departure. As a central figure, he has been for many of us a yardstick with which to measure our own smaller contributions. That is a unique role that few of us can make.

He knows that he is not indispensable because he has the sense of this body that it must go on. But he also knows that he has made a contribution, because he is aware of the attitude of his colleagues. It is not necessary to belabor that respect, that affection, that sense of his contribution, further here today.

There is a life after Congress. We all know that. I think that life will be a rich one for anybody with Dick's abilities and qualities and inquisitiveness. His citizenship, in whatever way, it manifests itself, will continue to be a national asset, and I think he knows that he goes out from here leaving behind many people who are grateful for not just his service, not just his relationship to the institution, but the warm and the personal friendship that is possible for such a man to have in wide numbers in whatever institution with which he is associated.

□ 1500

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, so many fine things have been said about Dick Bolling that it would be impossible to top any of them. I guess I have one great regret, as Dick Bolling leaves here, that I ought to express right now, and that is the regret that while he has been here I have not followed him as closely as I should.

If a poll were taken of this House as to who is the most admired and respected, I think there is no doubt in my mind that it would be Dick Bolling. He has a dedication and a purpose about all of his actions. I think that dedication and purpose means that he is committed to the idea that free people can govern themselves in a democratic manner through a body such as the House of Representatives.

He has contributed so importantly to this body that only history will ever be able to fully understand what he has done. But it is important not only to this body, but to other legislative bodies through the 50 States and, in fact, throughout the world, because what happens here is often emulated in our States and emulated throughout the world.

So, Dick, as you sit there and contemplate what your accomplishments have been, as we try to enumerate them, I want you to know that this one Member respects you and has a great deal of affection for you and has a great deal of admiration for what you have accomplished in the time that you have been here.

Dick, we need more people like you, but I do not think there is a mold that has been preserved like you.

So, we wish you well. We know you will continue to contribute and we hope that Missouri or some other part of the Nation will send us another Dick Bolling real soon.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman and I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Rudd).

Mr. RUDD. I thank my colleague for yielding and also express my appreciation for his thoughtfulness in taking this very important and very special, special order for today for Dick Bolling.

I consider Dick to be a very highly respected leader of the House of Representatives and also to be a formidable Congressman in action on the floor of the House of Representatives.

When he makes up his mind to take a course of action he will not be swerved, and if he feels he is right he is completely dedicated in pursuing that course of action.

Speaking for myself alone, as a Member of this body, he is one Member that gets my attention immediately and holds it, and I think that that in itself is a great compliment to the man himself.

I have enjoyed knowing him personally and I have especially been very pleased to observe his as an example of what a very successful, very effective Congressman should be in action, and he has been a lesson to me in that regard and that in itself is appreciated very much.

I know that there have been a lot of nice things said about Dick today by people who have known him for a number of years, and I wish that I may have had a closer relationship with him so that I could observe more closely what he has done in action, and I wish him well in all of his future endeavors and again I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking this special order.

A TRIBUTE TO RICHARD BOLLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Murtha). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to join in the second part of this special order with my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Gephardt), in paying tribute to Hon. Richard Bolling, who has announced his retirement from this body.

I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, I was a 17-year-old high school senior coming to Washington, D.C., to see President Harry Truman inaugurated in January of 1949. On the train coming up here I remember very well people talking about their new Congressman from Kansas City, Dick Bolling. I did not meet him then but I heard good things about him then, and it was my pleasure in later years to get to know him, to call him a friend, and to serve with him in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, he is a gentleman of great stature. He is one who has always had the time to give advice to a friend, and I might say that one of his greatest attributes with all of his talents and all of his work and all of his skill is the loyalty that he has displayed to his friend, the encouragement, the word of "You can do it," the suggestion on how to do it better. These have been his hallmarks from a friend's point of view.

I remember on one occasion when seeking advice from him he said there are two ways to look at things. One way is negative and the other is positive. He said, "I prefer the positive."

That has been his rule through the years.

Mr. Speaker, Dick Bolling is a man of great talents. If you have been so blessed with the talents as this gentleman from Missouri, and like the Good Book said, one is not to hide those talents, one is not to hide his light under a bushel and, Mr. Speaker, Dick Bolling has not hidden his talents, but he has been a meteor to light the skies in our period of history.

I am proud to call him my friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, when our good friend and colleague Richard Bolling leaves the House next year after 34 years in Congress, it will mark the end of one of the most distinguished and remarkable careers in the history of this legislative body. During these 17 terms in Congress, Dick Bolling has rendered superlative service to the people of the Kansas City area, the State of Missouri, and the Nation. No Member of Congress in our lifetime has done more for Congress as an institution. His influence has been profound, positive, and lasting.

As a legislator, Dick Bolling is a keen strategist, a peerless coalition builder, and a master of the House rules and procedures. Reforms that made the House more democratic and responsive, civil rights legislation, and the Budget Act are all evidence of his skill and energy. Yet, I believe his most lasting monument will be his efforts to preserve the integrity of the House as an institution. Throughout his career, he has recognized, as perhaps no other legislator in our time, that Congress must exercise its responsibilities as a coequal branch of Government in order for our system to flourish. At the same time, he has been in the forefront of efforts to make the House and its procedures more accountable, more open, and more responsive to the people we were elected to serve. His work in this area has won him the admiration and respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the press, and the public. It is safe to say that this House of Representatives is a far greater institution for Dick Bolling's having served here.

As a new Member of Congress in 1977, I appreciated Dick Bolling's willingness to share the benefits of his experience, and I appreciated his wise counsel on complicated issues and procedures. I am indeed proud to have had the opportunity to serve in Congress with Dick Bolling, and to have him as a friend. His leaving creates a void in this institution, and in our State delegation, that will not be filled easily. I know I speak for all House Members when I say that I hope he will continue to let us have the benefit of his wisdom, his leadership, and his friendship for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Bennett).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I had the great privilege of coming to Congress at the same time Dick Bolling came. When I came here with him I knew he was a real leader. In the years I have been here, I think that Speaker Rayburn and Dick Bolling are probably the two most able legislators that I have served with. I feel he is the strongest man and most able man and most dedicated man to American ideals that we have in the House of Representatives today—a man of great intelligence, a man of great character, honesty and courage are qualities of his life.

Mr. Speaker, I used to practice law years ago and I always thought if I could be a lawyer's lawyer the people would look at me as somebody who really could be a leader among lawyers. I really would have made the top rung in my life. Now that I have come to Congress and been here these years, I look about me and think about the years and the types of people I have served with, and I think there has been one man who has been outstanding as a Congressman's Congressman, and that is Dick Bolling.

I remember many problems that I tried to tackle here that I did not really tackle just right. Dick, I think, is probably younger than I am, but his counsel and guidance was so good in these things. Particularly I remember I was uptight about trying to accomplish an ethics group, a committee here, and if it had not been for Dick Bolling we never would have put it together properly. I put together, but it was a hodgepodge compared to what we finally attained. This is one example among many.

I think almost all of the great legislation this Congress has passed since Dick has been here has had his hand on it and it has been already mentioned the fact despite all of these great qualities of character and leadership, at the heart of it is a very great man, a man of compassion, a man of thoughtfulness and kindness for his fellow man. The little man is his concern. The concern of this great country is his concern. It is a great pleasure to serve with Dick. It must be wonderful to leave an institution when you are at the height of your ability and still have many good years ahead of you. That is a nice time. I think most people outrun their time.

In the case of Dick Bolling, he goes out like a meteor, of course he is going on to other things which, I am sure, will be rewarding for the country. He is leaving here with not only the great respect of the Congress but the great respect of his country and the love and affection of all Members of Congress.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. Rousselot).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding and want to thank both of our colleagues from Missouri for taking this time to not only pay tribute to Dick Bolling but also to say thank you for your service to this House of Representatives.

So many things have already been said that I wish to say and so I hope my colleagues will permit me to maybe be a little bit repetitious, but I think they bear repeating because of the fine way in which Dick Bolling has served as a major leader in the Congress of the United States.

First of all, I very much respect Dick as a presiding officer of this body, as one who attempts to get attention here and there during the proceedings. He was always extremely fair and made sure that those who were seeking attention did receive it, but also made sure that the House remembered that there was an orderly process by which we should abide. He did not hesitate at any moment to call to our attention when we were violating those rules of the House or stepping aside in an appropriate manner.

□ 1510

I guess the second reason that many of us appreciated his fine service in the House and have appreciated it is because he was so involved in that process, as has already been stated, so totally understood the legislative process and participated in it to such an extent himself that he made it a really living, moving process, which we can all appreciate.

I think many of us are very grateful for the time and effort that Dick Bolling spent in trying to reorganize this House in a more meaningful way. He spent endless hours trying to guide us to do the things we should do and reducing overlapping jurisdictions among our many committees and trying to get us to pay attention to the business at hand in a way that would be more meaningful and I think we really need to say thank you for the tremendous amount of time that he spent in trying to give us a reorganization plan that would be helpful to the whole process.

I had an opportunity to serve with Dick Bolling on the Joint Economic Committee. He made sure when he was chairman of that committee or vice chairman, or whatever, that we forced ourselves to listen to all aspects of discussion on economic affairs, brought in every possible authority that he could find to make sure that we were doing our job and that even though the Joint Economic Committee has no legislative responsibility, the responsibilities that do reside to report to the Budget Committee, to report to the House, to give regular reports on what the economic facts of life are, he follows through on that in a very positive and constructive way. I know that he made sure that those of us who were on the committee did our part to also participate.

As has already been stated, the reason that he was so successful is that he has a deep love and respect for the House of Representatives and what it is supposed to mean as the people's body. He made sure that we remember that and when he was presiding over this body, when he had to call us to task for not giving it that due respect, he certainly did so in a very sometimes sharp, but I think, very positive way.

Though it has been stated that he has been a tough minded leader, and that is certainly true, as one who is on the opposite side of the fence on many of tne issues with Dick Bolling I can say he is tough-minded; but also he had a sense of compassion, as has already been stated so well, and he expressed it very well when he was taking the floor on those given issues or participating in the Rules Committee to make sure that adequate rules were given for the several points of view.

So we do have a respect, most of us, I think, if not all of us, for that tremendous capability that he brought to the House, with that love and sense of this House that is so needed and he made sure we, too, respected it.

I guess I have enjoyed knowing Dick Bolling primarily because he has been a strong leader. I think strong leadership is needed desperately and he always was there to provide it. Whether you agreed with him or not, and I did not many times find myself in agreement politically, as has been stated by many on our side, you knew that he was there, that he would participate as a strong leader and that you better know your facts and case before you came to present it.

I thank the gentleman again for taking this time. I think it is very refreshing to say thank you to somebody before they have departed to another world, so I thank the gentleman for taking this time, both gentlemen.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from California.

I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. O'NEILL. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no one in this House who appreciates and respects Dick Bolling more than I do. In 1954 both of us were placed on the Rules Committee and we sat side by side for 18 years. You get to know a man well when you work at his side for 18 years. Dick Bolling's knowledge and skill is extraordinary.

He is also among the most conscientious Members of this body. I have seen him kind and gentle and I have seen him mean and tough—mean and tough, with a Member of this Congress he thought had ability and who came before the Rules Committee unprepared. Dick Bolling has always been prepared. His commitment to excellence is tireless; his dedication to his duties is total.

Dick's legislative contributions are almost overwhelming. For example, we were floundering when the Civil Rights Act was before us and here came a son of the South who was the strongest arm in the House in moving that historic legislation.

In my 30 years here, there has not been a reform in this Congress that Dick Bolling did not conceive.

I remember the 1966 committee; I was on it myself. The ideas all germinated from Dick.

And I wonder where the Nation would have gone if we had not established the Budget Committee about 6 years ago, the brainchild of Dick Bolling.

Nobody loves this House more than Dick does. He understands its rules. He understands its history, and the sensitivity by which it operates. He is a master in the operation of this Congress. He has the respect of the House every time he takes the floor and he always handles the tough ones. Dick has never stepped back from a tough issue. The tougher they are, the better he likes it.

Knowing Dick as I did through the days when we were writing Johnson's "Great Society" legislation—the sensitivity that he had for America, for education, for the poor and the elderly—he helped construct this legislation and played a significant role in its passage.

We hate to see Dick leave. But it is of his own choice. I do not know how or when or if his shoes will ever be filled here.

As Speaker of the House, Dick, I want to say publicly what a great friend you are, and what a debt of gratitude I owe to you for the strong arm you have been, for your loyalty, for your brilliance—a friend I could always count on. You will be missed, not only be me, Dick, but by anyone and everyone who has known you along life's line.

May God's blessing be with you, Dick. You are a great guy.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. Derrick).

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for recognizing me and I thank the gentleman for taking these special orders this afternoon.

You know, I have been sitting here a little bit in a daze, I guess, because although I knew that Dick was going to retire, I really had not allowed myself to think about it too much, because it is hard for me to picture this House of Representatives without Dick Bolling.

There is no queston about it, I am asked from time to time, who is the greatest mind in the House? It takes me about 2 seconds to say, "Dick Bolling."

I remember one time having a discussion with my son. He was concerned about something that had happened at school that he had done, and he felt that his popularity had been threatened. I remember telling him, "Well, son, you probably have two routes to take. One, you will be respected, and the other, you will be popular; not necessarily do they run in a parallel pair."

☐ 1520

Well, Dick Bolling today stands as the most respected man in the House. You know, I have seen him when he did not care about his popularity and I doubt that he does right now. But in spite of it, he has ended up as probably the most popular man in the House as well.

I guess probably a lot of folks found out what I found out about him: that his bite is significant, but his bark is a little louder. He is a legislator's legislator.

I look in that corner. I do not know how may offices he has in this institution, but I know where his busiest office is. It is right over there against the wall, or in one of those seats to my left. I know times that I have had to get fifth and sixth in line and move down like musical chairs so I could have a conference with him.

One of the proudest things I ever had said to me was by a man who got mad with me and did not particularly like my chairman and referred to him as my mentor in this House, and I plead guilty to that. It has been a wonderful experience.

You know, there is no telling how many Members are still in this House today who would not be here because of Dick Bolling. I know I am not alone, because I discussed it with other Members over the years. Those who are thinking about leaving Congress, those who are thinking about running for the lower body, those who are thinking about running for offices back home, and they look at Dick Bolling and they say, "You know, if he stayed here for this many years, and he was able to shake this institution, maybe I can make a contribution as well," and have stayed on.

I would not be on the Rules Committee today if it were not for Dick. He encouraged me, he helped me, he trusted me, and he asked others to trust me who did not know me as well, and that is why I am proud to be on the Rules Committee— the first member to serve on the Rules Committee from the State of South Carolina since 1932. I do not know, but I hope the Rules Committee is as important as I tell my constituents it is, and I think it is. I hope it will retain its importance when Dick leaves.

As has been said before, and as I have talked with him over the last several years, there are very few things that can be mentioned, major accomplishments—and some of them not accomplishments—that Dick Bolling did not have a part in, so I will not be repetitious. I will just say, you know, Dick, I am going to miss you; God, I am going to miss you. But as you leave, I want you to know that I have always thought of you as a man's man. You know, I have always thought of you as a character out of Hemingway, or maybe Hemingway himself—a man with a great mind, a man that loves the out of doors, loves his fellowman, but has respect for him. And certainly a man who does not suffer fools lightly.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and very much appreciate his taking this time to pay tribute to someone who has served this institution so very well.

I, in particular, had not yet been born when Dick Bolling came to this institution. At this point I am still just midway through my freshman term in the Congress. But ever since I was a student of political science, Dick Bolling was my model of what an effective Member of this body exemplified.

Dick Bolling really cares about people, and he understands the processes that need to be used to follow through.

I think I would just have one request for Dick Bolling, and really think I speak on behalf of a number of the younger Members, and that, Dick, is that we just hope you will remain as accessible to us as you have been this year. The chance to have your counsel and your advice in the years ahead is something that will be of great help to me, and I think many of the other younger Members. We are still looking forward to working with him in the years ahead.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DYSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I was born the year that Dick Bolling came to the Congress, and about 27 years after that I had a dream. I had a dream of coming to the Congress, and in 1976 I ran for the U.S. Congress from the State of Maryland. I had a fund raiser in a little place called Great Mills, in St. Mary's County, Md., and I was so bold as to write a letter to a U.S. Congressman by the name of Dick Bolling to ask him to come and to be the guest speaker at this fund raiser. A few weeks later I received a letter, indicating he would come. And he did come and he made a tremendous impression. I realized it was a difficult thing to go into an area where nobody knows you and make a speech everyone enjoys and everyone likes. But he did it. He came with his lovely wife James Grant Bolling, and they both made a tremendous impression.

When he left, he left me with a dream, a dream of some day being able to come to the Congress—I thought it would be 1976, but I had to wait—for the day to be able to sit in the U.S. Congress and call Dick Bolling my colleague. I have realized that dream, and it has been an honor to be associated with him. I am sorry to see him go.

No tribute to Representative Bolling would be complete however, without mention of his wife James Grant Bolling who passed away in 1979. Her own accomplishments were commendable by themselves. She created the Congressional Relations Office at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Kennedy administration and helped form the Congressional Club here on the Hill. But the strength of this extraordinary woman to her husband stemmed from the fact that she stood by his side in good times and bad, helped in his office and was his confidant and best friend.

Mr. Speaker, it has not only been a pleasure to know Congressman Richard Bolling in the House of Representatives, but also to have worked with and learned from him. The people of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District are losing a fine and dedicated public servant and Congress is losing a distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I want Dick Bolling to know that his colleagues not only tip their hats to his service to this Nation—but we tip our hearts to him as well for his friendship and his leadership.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Missouri for taking this time to pay tribute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Bolling).

I remember Dick Bolling when I was first elected to Congress over 23 years ago. I came to Washington for the first time in my life in December, prior to being sworn in, and I met Dick Bolling, and our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Thompson, and I remember how impressed I was then with his knowledge, his legislative wisdom, and his political good sense. Over all these years, my admiration for him has not changed.

Often we have occasion to salute a retiring Member, but I think this is a unique occasion, because I do not think to anyone in our time are we so indebted for having contributed so much to the institution of the House of Representatives, not only in the reform sense, in the sense of changing the institution to conform to the postwar days of World War II, to modern times, but for infusing a sense of responsibility, a sense of integrity in this institution, and it has been under attack. So quite apart from calling him a friend and enjoying his presence, sharing in his wisdom, we will miss one of the people who has had the greatest impact on the House of Representatives in modern times, and has steadfastly tried, I think wisely so, to cause this institution to be more responsive to people's needs.

So we will miss him as he goes, we will miss him as a friend, as someone who counsels us from time to time, both in terms of his party's policies and legislation and also in terms of what we ought to look like as an institution in 1982 and the years ahead.

□ 1530

So, I am pleased to join with the gentleman in saluting my friend, Dick Bolling.

Mr. SKELTON. I do appreciate the gentleman's words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Massachusetts (Mr. Moakley).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to be able to participate in this special order and commend the Missouri delegation with this opportunity to honor one of its most able and distinguished Members, Dick Bolling.

During two terms as chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Missouri has had an opportunity to play a key leadership role, one which he had actually performed without portfolio for a generation. He has served as the most effective advocate of the concept of party government in the House, demanding of his party that it always have a program and use every tool at its disposal to deliver that program. But this demand has never taken the form of obstruction and he has served four Republican Presidents as loyally as the four Democrats who have been President during his public life.

He has been an effective and loyal "right arm" to every Speaker since Sam Rayburn. But he has never subverted his own independence and conscience to that loyalty. During the service of John McCormack, the gentleman was the most formidable force in the House in calling its leadership to account. But, to the day Speaker McCormack died, neither of them ever lost the personal respect in which they held each other. Indeed, at the time of the late Speaker's death, the gentleman from Missouri made an extraordinarily fine tribute which I take the liberty of borrowing to apply to the gentleman, himself:

> He is probably the best Democrat I ever saw. He was one of the greatest fighters of all time. I will never forget him as long as I live as one of the people who taught me not only to love this House, but to love working on behalf of the people that he worked for and that I hope all of us work for, and those are the people of this country who cannot have the strength themselves and need the compassion and the help of those that love them.

It is sad that DICK BOLLING is leaving the House at the time when this ideal to which he has called it, is so dangerously threatened by those who would rule this land by ledgers rather than vision. Battles are ahead in this Congress in which our party will need its greatest fighter. But battles will continue in future Congresses in which we will equally need his vision and his advice. I know, even in retirement, that he will continue his fight from other forums with the same energy, intellect, and compassion he brought to this Chamber for so many years.

I will always be grateful to fate that I have had the honor of serving on the Rules Committee during his chairmanship. The lessons I have learned will serve me well throughout my career. As chairman, he has been a strong conscience, a tireless leader, but most of all, a good friend.

Every Member tries to represent his constituents and to remain in close touch with their concerns, but we need to be reminded that our district has sent us to a national assembly which must address the needs of a great country. The fair balancing of local and national concerns is no easy matter but no one has served as a better model to us all than DICK BOLLING.

I can recall no issue or real importance during the brief time I have served in this House, in which the gentleman has not been at the forefront of the fight. Some of those fights have been won and some have not, but what all of us will remember is that each was fought well, each was fought fairly, and both the defeats and the victories have been accepted with honor, with dignity, and with grace.

I thank my friend from Missouri for taking this special order and giving me an opportunity to participate. It is difficult for me to say goodby to DICK BOLLING. It is even more difficult to say it well. But with all sincerity, I wish the gentleman well and assure him of my loyalty and my friendship in all the years ahead.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Missouri (Mr. VOLKMER).

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to thank the gentleman in the well and my other colleague from Missouri, Congressman GEPHARDT, for taking this time to pay tribute to a person who has been described as perhaps having been very important in reform, and having had more effect on the structure of this body than any other person in modern history. I, too, agree with that.

I, too, wish to pay tribute to the gentleman, a colleague of mine from Missouri. Even though I feel that we have had others from Missouri, from my district especially, who have served in this House so well in the past, such as Champ Clark, such as Clarence Cannon, I put DICK BOLLING right along there with them. I am quite proud to be able to stand here today and feel that I have served with a gentleman of his stature even though at times we have disagreed on issues, and there are times that we have agreed on many others, but I think very firmly that he and I agree very strongly that in the institution it is the foremost issue, and that it is the institution which he has worked so well in fostering and providing the procedural changes that are needed and have been needed. He has had an effect on the structure of this institution that is necessary for the institution to prevail, and he has helped to bring this institution to where it is today.

I agree with those who have said that he has had more effect than any other person in modern history on this institution, and I want to congratulate him. I look forward to working 1 more year with him in this institution, and, I hope, working with him thereafter for many more years.

Thank you very much for being here, DICK.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.).

Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard about this special order, and I came over from my office to say just one or two things. I have only been in this body for a relatively short period of time compared to the great service that has been the whole life of DICK BOLLING in the Congress of the United States. I have never missed an opportunity to listen to this great legislator when he stood where I am standing now or in the well of this House, because what he said was worth listening to.

I know on many occasions that my vote and his vote have not been the same, but my respect and admiration for DICK BOLLING is without parallel in this House. His wisdom and his perseverance at times will be missed, sorely missed. I hope that in the coming years that he continues to enjoy the best of health, that he will continue to visit with us from time to time. I realize that he has another year, but I would have been remiss had I not been here today to pay my deep respects to this outstanding legislator and gentleman. I know of nothing more than one can say when one refers to him as the gentleman that I know he is, and the high regard and respect that he is held in by every Member of this body.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his participation in the special order today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my many colleagues in honoring one of the great congressional leaders of this century, DICK BOLLING of Missouri.

When DICK BOLLING announced his retirement, he explained that he felt he would be "more useful to the causes he believes in out, than in." If that is in fact true, then despite our sense of loss over the departure of an esteemed colleague, we all must be heartened over the prospects of his work on the outside.

For the causes of DICK BOLLING are the best causes any of us can believe in. Since coming to Congress in 1948, he has been the premier champion of institutional reform in the Congress, leading the struggle to overturn the strict seniority system that strangled the institution for so long, and bringing democracy to the House. His work in trying to reform the House and its committee system in the 1970's and his two outstanding books on the workings of the House show his exceptional mastery of the legislative process.

In addition to the institutional reforms, he also played a major role in many of the great policy issues of our times. His understanding of legislative strategy and the House rules was key to the passage of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, and led to adoption of the congressional budget process in 1974.

But it is more than his parliamentary wizardry, political acumen, intellectual brilliance, and his articulate and constructive criticism of the institution in which he has served the people of Missouri's Fifth District for 34 years that has distinguished his career.

What will be missed most when Dick Bolling retires is his integrity. He did not preach integrity, he personified it. I am reminded of an address by Edmund Burke, a Member of Parliament speaking to his constituents at Bristol in 1774, a speech often quoted by Dick Bolling to his own constituents.

Burke's words defines a legislator's responsibility as well as the courage, wisdom, and political judgment that he or she must exercise. In my mind, Burke's remarks typify Dick Bolling's philosophy of the role of the legislator, and the kind of integrity which has been his trademark in Congress.

> Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in strictest union, the closest correspondence and the most unreserved communication with his constituents * * * But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living * * * Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

Fortunately, even after he retires, the example of Dick Bolling will remain for us all.

You have probably guessed by now how highly I think of Dick Bolling. I came quickly to learn just what an extraordinarily fine human being he is while serving with him on the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee. I have great admiration for him and value his counsel, his friendship, and his wisdom.

Most of what I have said so far about Dick Bolling is, I expect, rather similar to what many of my colleagues will say today in honoring one of the most respected Members of this body. I have one other comment, however, that very few other Members are likely to make.

For all the deep respect and admiration many Members feel toward Dick Bolling, he has earned a reputation for not going out of his way to win popularity contests. As he himself once put it, "I have never been too good at buttering up my colleagues."

That may be the case. But in one area, Dick Bolling has far exceeded most other Members in his treatment of his colleagues, and has particularly earned this Member's respect and gratitude. "Sensitive" is not a word too many of our colleagues would use in describing Dick Bolling. But he, in fact, possesses a degree of sensitivity toward human beings unlike that of any political figure I have known. I have never known him to say an unkind word about any individual. He treats Members, staff, constituents, and men and women in all walks of life with consideration and equality. Above all he is honest—the most intellectually honest person I have known.

Dick Bolling possesses those rare qualities of integrity, honesty, grace, and class—qualities seldom found today in any walk of life.●

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honor to rise today to join my colleagues in saluting Dick Bolling, who without question has been one of the most outstanding Members to ever serve in this august body.

During his nearly 32 years of service in the House, Dick Bolling has compiled an enviable record as both a leader and a lawmaker.

Perhaps no other Member in recent times has had so great an influence on the actual day to day operations of the House of Representatives as has Dick Bolling. He was the brilliant master planner whose reform proposals made the House a more effective body in dealing with the highly complex problems facing our Nation.

Of major importance was his redesigning of the Federal budget process which ended the old system in which spending bills were routinely passed one by one without concern for their effect on the overall economy.

Dick Bolling's self-proclaimed longterm love affair with the House of Representatives will never be forgotten. A highly prolific writer, he has written several books dealing with the House that serve as standard reference materials for any student of politics.

As chairman of the House Rules Committee, Congressman Bolling has added a new dimension of efficient leadership to that position resulting in assured quick and thorough consideration of the bills presented to that highly important panel.

Dick Bolling will also be long remembered in this House and by the people of our Nation for his efforts in securing passage of legislation to better the lives of all segments of our society.

As a member of the Rules Committee, he played a key role in helping obtain passage of the 1964 civil rights bill and vital labor legislation that bettered the lives of millions of American workers.

The people of Kansas City are losing a great Representative in Dick Bolling. His decision to retire at the end of this session of Congress is also a loss to all Americans. A man with the abilities and insight of Dick Bolling will sorely be missed as this House attempts to deal with the current economic and social turmoil in the Nation.

While he may be retiring from the House, one thing is certain; we have not heard the last from Dick Bolling.

Dick, I am proud to have known and worked with you.●

● Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Representative Dick Bolling after an extraordinary record of service in the U.S. Congress expanding 30 years is both a time for profound sorrow and great exultation.

Sorrow—in that the Congress loses a courageous statesman extraordinaire.

Exultation—in view of the remarkable contribution of service not only to his beloved State of Missouri but to the entire Nation.

The U.S. House of Representatives will not be the same without our highly esteemed Dick Bolling. It is significant that Mr. Bolling in his collective service to Missouri and the Nation represented the essence of a caring, compassionate, scholarly, and politically effective statesman. His refreshing civility, ability to unravel parliamentary thickets, and his fierce commitment to improving the body politic made him a highly respected Member of this body.

We shall never forget his wit, strong commitment to civil and human rights, deep belief in human possibilities for all of our citizens, and a desire to extend and enrich the ideals of our Nation which made his presence here one that made a difference.

It is difficult for many from the perspective of the 1980's to understand the dichotomy that existed in our Nation in the 1950's and 1960's when black and nonwhite Americans were even more distant from the mainstream of American life. This dichotomy even had the blessing of our Nation as reflected in the law at the time and the support of many Members of the Congress who were unwilling to break with ancient traditions. Dick Bolling as a member of the House Rules Committee often fought a lonely battle in working to move civil rights and civil liberties legislation forward at a time when such legislation and those who advocated it were unpopular. However, he never wavered in his commitment and in time was able to move vital civil rights and civil liberties legislation forward as well as become chairman of the House Rules Committee.

As a fellow Congressman from Missouri, I shall miss the profound commitment that this master of the rules of the House evidenced in the Congress. Not only was he admired for his knowledge of the institution, but also for his appreciation and respect for the highest traditions of the institution. His career can indeed be categorized as a profile in courage, profound sensitivity, and a rigorous application of prodigious intellect.

I shall miss his resolute belief in the power of the rule of law and his determination to develop a just and caring society. The retirement of Richard Bolling, a master of parliamentary strategy signifies the end of an era but his legacy will become a part of the institution and traditions he so greatly respected and indeed personified, and will make an indelible impression for all Congressmen who follow in his footsteps.

I wish this exemplary statesman Godspeed, good health, and personal fulfillment as he undertakes other interests of his choosing.

A Dick Bolling does not retire, he simply commences to start anew in other undertakings.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is both an honor and a sad duty to participate in this special order to pay tribute to our esteemed and beloved friend and colleague Dick Bolling. It is an honor simply because all of us who have served with and know Dick Bolling do consider it an honor. It is a sad duty because we will be saying farewell to Dick after this session of Congress adjourns.

Since 1948, the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri have been provided with the highest quality representation by Dick Bolling. His attention to constituent needs is unparalleled and has served as a exemplary example for all who have followed him into the House.

History will treat Dick Bolling with respect and reverence. He has served with particular distinction as chairman of the House Rules Committee—one of the most prestigious and important of all positions in Congress. He has presided over the committee during some of the most tumultuous days in the history of the House. Dick has always wielded his considerable power with equity—the Rules Committee has been accessible to each and every Member of this House.

In many ways Dick serves as one of the consciences of the House. His knowledge about the inner workings of this institution is without peer. His authority in turn is derived from both his knowledge and experience. He is a professor of House processes and many of us can call ourselves his students.

Dick's two books, "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House" are testaments to the genius of Dick Bolling.

It seems hard to fully put into words the appreciation which we his colleagues feel for Dick Bolling. I have a deep and abiding respect for Dick. While it is said that no one is indispensable, the departure of Dick Bolling will leave the House a lesser place.

Perhaps our best tribute to him would be to try and emulate him in our daily activities as Members. I wish him a peaceful and prosperous alternative career and hope he will stay close to Washington for his counsel will always be in the highest demand.●

● Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to one of the great Members in the history of the House of Representatives, our colleague Richard Bolling of Missouri.

Richard Bolling has devoted 34 years to public service in the Congress. Few Members have a record which can equal his. His major achievements were in helping modernize the processes of the House, drafting the Budget Act of 1974 and pushing through the landmark civil rights legislation of the 1950's and 1960's from his key post on the Rules Committee. His presence in the Congress contributed to a better life for millions of Americans.

In addition to his activities as a Member of Congress, Richard Bolling has a well-deserved reputation as a distinguished author and interpreter of this institution. His books, "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House," are must reading for any student of the Congress. No doubt, now that he has more free time, other important contributions to the literature on Congress will be forthcoming. Perhaps more than any other Member, Richard Bolling has shaped perceptions of the internal workings of Congress in the media, in academia and among the public generally, and he will continue to do so.

Richard Bolling has built a reputation as someone who knows how to use power wisely. He has been a member of the Rules Committee for most of his tenure in the House, and chairman for the last 4 years. Before assuming the chairmanship himself in 1979, he was the de facto leader of the committee's majority, the eyes and ears of the leadership, the man who could solve problems and provide guidance at crucial points in the legislative process.

Often overlooked because of Congressman Bolling's vital role on the Rules Committee is his other committee assignment on the Joint Economic Committee. He also had the opportunity to serve briefly there as chairman before assuming leadership of Rules. Richard Bolling has always been interested in the substance of economic policy as well as the congressional process for enacting it, and focused the Joint Committee on conducting significant studies of the economy during his chairmanship.

Another important part of Dick Bolling's career here was his role as a presiding officer in the House and the Committee of the Whole on controversial matters. His thorough knowledge of the rules and ability to maintain order were important in the expeditious consideration of many pieces of major legislation.

When I took office last June and wanted to learn how the House of Representatives worked from the inside, I went to see Dick Bolling and to observe the Rules Committee in action. I got a good education, and I shall always be grateful to the chairman for taking the time to explain the process and offer advice based on his rich experience here.

With the retirement of Richard Bolling, the House has lost an original. There is really no one, on either side of the aisle, who can ever play quite the role he has.●

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, our brilliant colleague and the very best friend a man could have, Dick Bolling, has announced that he will retire from Congress after 34 years of distinguished service.

As deeply as we revere Dick Bolling as a friend, we also respect him as a leader in this House. Dick has always given unselfishly of his time, counsel, and vast experience to his colleagues. He is a consummate strategist who possesses a complete mastery of parliamentary procedures.

With his remarkable intellect and encyclopedic knowledge of congressional operations Dick has led the way to countless reforms. I am sure that most of our colleagues have devoured Dick's excellent books on how Congress works and how it should work. These books epitomize Dick Bolling's knack for incisive analysis and thoughtful recommendations.

Dick Bolling cares about Congress and the millions of people we represent. Throughout his exceptional career in public service, his intellectual gifts and parliamentary skills have been focused on making the Government more responsive and effective. Among his many outstanding achievements is designing the Federal budget process and devising a plan for reorganization of the Federal Government.

We will sorely miss Dick when he retires at the end of the year, but his influence on this House and our Nation will long be felt. We will miss his wit, his understanding and his wise counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself fortunate to serve with Dick Bolling and to know he is my friend.●

● Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I regard Dick Bolling as one of the outstanding Members of Congress whom I have had the pleasure of meeting and working with since 1971. He unquestionably knows more of the operation of the Congress than any Member we now have. One of his great characteristics has been his willingness to listen to and to help new Members as they launch their careers in the House. It is a great loss to all of us to have Dick leave. I will personally miss him as a friend and an advisor, who has helped me so many times over the years.●

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure and a privilege for me to have the opportunity to honor our distinguished colleague, Dick Bolling, who will be retiring at the end of this session of Congress. Thirty-four years of dedicated excellence is this brilliant public servant's record: Excellence in service to his State, to his country and, perhaps most of all, to this institution, the U.S. House of Representatives. No more profound thinker or more capable parliamentarian has ever occupied the chairmanship of the Committee on Rules, on which it has been my privilege to serve with him. Dick's retirement will be an inestimable loss to the committee and to this body, both of which he has served with the deepest dedication.

It is fitting that the day we pay tribute to Richard Bolling is also the day that we paid tribute in a joint session of Congress to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. What one man began—blazing a new trail as to the proper role of Government and in so doing extending the warm and willing helping hand of Government to those in need of assistance—the other man has continued.. The contributions made by Dick Bolling, legislatively, procedurely, and as a humanitarian and author, will be an enduring testimonial to the eminence of the man and an example for all of us, and to those who will occupy our places in this body in the future, to emulate.●

● Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in this tribute to my friend Dick Bolling. Dick's inspired leadership helped bring about changes in the seniority system in House voting procedures, in the congressional budget process—all aimed at making this body more responsible and accountable to the citizens.

Through his skills as a master parliamentarian, and his chairmanship of the Rules Committee, Dick has served as a major House strategist for progressive legislation. He has played an invaluable role in assembling the coalitions that have passed the major domestic programs of this generation, including our landmark civil rights legislation. As a member and former chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, he shares my concern with the need for America's economic renewal.

More than for his considerable legislative achievements, however, Dick will be remembered for his concern for the House as an institution. As father to the House reform movement, he has left his mark on younger colleagues, and on the structure and procedures of the House. In this way, Dick's contributions to this body will transcend his long and productive term in office.

He carries with him into retirement our gratitude for his statesmanship, our appreciation for his friendship, and our best wishes for a long and happy postcongressional career.●

● Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing my tremendous respect and admiration for a distinguished Member of this body, the Honorable Richard Bolling of Missouri.

Dick Bolling is leaving the House at the end of this session, but his service here will be long remembered. I have served with Dick on the Committee on Rules since 1965, and it has been a true pleasure.

Dick is a brilliant man, whose intellect and political skill will remain a benchmark for those who follow him to this body. His dedication has made him an outstanding Representative for his people, and his leadership has had a significant impact on this House. The fundamental operations of this Congress have been markedly changed due to reforms he authored and standards he has set.

Dick is a persuasive spokesman for his party's views on national issues. We may have been adversaries from time to time, as controversial issues moved through this institution, but we never have been enemies. Dick Bolling is a formidable opponent, but one who always conducts himself with gentlemanly courtesy and fairness.

My admiration for Dick have increased with each year we have served together. I have no doubt that his voice will remain in our consciences long after the 97th Congress brings his career among us to an end.

Dick Bolling's presence here will be missed, but his contributions to this Congress will remain with us for years to come.●

● Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my distinguished chairman, Richard Bolling. When he leaves the Congress at the end of this session, this country will lose an able and effective Representative of the people, and this House will lose a man of honor, integrity, and intelligence. I will miss his steady hand, his level head, and his unparalleled devotion to this institution that is this House.

When I first entered Congress in 1979, I was given an awesome responsibility. I became only the second Democratic freshman Member in this century to be appointed to the Rules Committee, and it was Richard Bolling who became my tutor in the legislative process and who selflessly imparted his wisdom gained through his long and devoted service to his constituents, his country, and to the House of Representatives. I am indeed fortunate to have had this man as my chairman and my teacher.

However, Dick Bolling has not left us yet. The coming months will be difficult ones for this body and I for one am gratified that he will be here to assist us as we grapple with the enormous problems facing our Nation. His compassion and devotion to democratic principles will serve this country well in 1982 and his legacy will serve as a guidepost for those of us who will serve in future Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, just saying "thank you" does not seem adequate. You are a great American and I am proud to have served with you and prouder still to call you my friend.●

● Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in this tribute to the distinguished congressions' career of Richard Bolling. For the last 3 years I have had the very special privilege of being a member of the Rules Committee and had the benefit of serving under its chairman, Dick Bolling. This has been a rare and special privilege indeed, since I have met no one during my tenure in the House of Representatives more knowledgeable or more protective of the precedents and procedures of this great institution. Dick has demonstrated time and time again the importance of, and power wielded by a thorough understanding, appreciation, and utilization of the rules that govern this august body. He has not used this knowledge and subsequent power frivolously, or to further his own personal position but has displayed his prowess in the name of justness and equitability.

Dick's desire to better the inner workings of the House and to improve the efficiency of the legislative process has been well documented through his legislative career. His place in the history of the House of Representatives is secure. Years from now historians and political scholars alike would be remiss in their writings if they neglected to mention the contributions and insights provided by Dick Bolling.

All the members of the Rules Committee who have served with him, as well as the members who have testified before him, can verify that Dick Bolling's desire for fairness, equity, and evenhandedness is without question and beyond reproach. All of us have committed the Golden Rule to memory, but not everyone makes such a commitment to his life and his work. Dick Bolling has made this commitment.

The void left by his retirement will not be filled easily, if at all. During my years on the Rules Committee, Dick Bolling has been both a knowledgeable teacher and valued friend. I feel certain of his continued success in future endeavors, but his friendship and leadership in the House of Representatives will be sorely missed.●

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Dick Bolling has been called the intellectual father of the reform movement and a master strategist. These two descriptions accurately reflect the outstanding qualities and contributions of the dean of the Missouri delegation. I am honored to join in the tribute to a close and well-deserving friend.

Dick Bolling and I have served together in the House of Representatives for over 27 years. In that time, through four Speaker of the House and seven Presidents, Dick stands out as a tower of integrity and a beacon of brilliance. No one I have served with has been better equipped intellectually to meet and master the complexities of congressional action and politics. His unique combination of integrity and knowledge makes him a formidable foe and a valued ally.

My first year in the House was Dick's first year on the House Rules Committee. He was, of course, eventually to become its chairman and to become a principal draftsman in the reforms to make the House a more responsive institution. A believer in a strong Speaker and an active majority caucus, Dick was an important mainstay on the Rules Committee who facilitated the passage of landmark civil rights legislation.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee for 24 years, his interest in economics long predates this latest period when it has become fashionable to speak about deficits, inflation, and a balanced budget. In an effort to impose accountability on an old system where spending bills were passed without regard to their cumulative effect, Dick played a leading role in designing the new Federal budget process.

While it will not be unusual for history to show that Richard Bolling came into office in 1948 as a reformer, it will indeed be unique to record that his fire for reform has not died over 33 years. I know that I, along with our colleagues, will miss his wisdom, his inspiring insight, and his personal warmth.●

●Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to join in paying tribute to my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, Dick Bolling. We are all saddened to learn of Dick's plans of retirement for he will be missed.

It has been my good fortune to serve with Dick Bolling for the duration of his congressional career. Dick's contributions to this body are innumerable and his knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives is second to none. We in the Appropriations Committee have leaned heavily on Dick Bolling's expertise in bringing our bills to the House when circumstances have made necessary.

One of Dick's outstanding achievements was his key role in the creation of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and, perhaps more importantly, as chairman of the Rules Committee he helped us live with the Budget Act after its key protective provisions were set aside. The Budget Act was designed to make Congress more able to determine sound fiscal policy and establish national spending priorities.

The work of Dick Bolling has been exceptional. We will all miss Dick Bolling and his work here, and wish him well in all future endeavors.●

● Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to participate in this special order honoring the outstanding congressional career of a man who has dedicated more than three decades of his life to distinguished public service—Richard Bolling, of Missouri.

When I first came to Congress in 1967, it was Dick Bolling who taught me one of the simplest, yet most essential, of lessons: How to get votes in the absence of a quorum. There were two steps, he said. First, object to the vote on the basis that a quorum was not present. Second, make a point of order that a quorum was not present.

Even many veterans legislator still stumble over that modest procedure. In my own case, because of that 1 minute of this scholarly man's time, the rule has been fixed and simple for me.

Dick's mastery of the most minute detail of the legislative process is legendary, and his splendid service as chairman of the House Rules Committee will remain a legacy of exemplary leadership.

Dick Bolling is not only a gifted teacher, but a lasting friend. I shall miss his wise counsel and welcomed presence in these Halls.●

● Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in this tribute to Congressman Richard Bolling, who has announced that he will retire at the end of this year. Mr. Bolling has served in the House for over 32 years, and he currently continues in the very formidable task as chair of the House Rules Committee.

Congressman Bolling has stood in this very Chamber for many long hours to defend those principles and practices in which he and his constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of Missouri believe. Yet, his work was not limited only to his district. Chairman Bolling did not hesitate to serve strongly as a House Democratic leader, to address many issues which dealt with the need for fairness and equity for all citizens throughout this Nation.

Chairman Bolling is noted with respect for his arduous work in the area of congressional reform. His dedication and knowledge in this area were shared with many in his numerous articles and two books on the subject. Finally, Congressman Bolling was chairman of the Select Committee on Committees (1973–74) which produced a blueprint for revising and modernizing House committee structure and procedures.

Chairman Bolling is a respected member of the Joint Economic Committee. He has coauthored a book, "America's Competitive Edge," which addresses the renewal of America's economic strength. Such work once again demonstrates Mr. Bolling's willingness to expand his work beyond the Halls of the Congress.

It must also be noted that Dick Bolling played a leading role in the civil rights battles of the 1950's and 1960's. He is among those responsible for the enactment of critical legislation, during those years, which embodied many of the social changes of the Johnson and Kennedy administrations.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have served with Chairman Bolling in this House. However, I do know that he will now have even more of a chance to share himself with many others, through his writing and other work. I wish him the very best.●

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to be able to honor Dick Bolling, a close personal friend of mine, as he begins the last year of his remarkable congressional career.

As a Member of this body for the past 33 years and as chairman of the prestigious Rules Committee, Dick Bolling has provided the House of Representatives, his constituents, and the United States with distinguished service. His hard work and relentless effort helped implement many meaningful programs that have improved the quality of life for all Americans. Dick can look back on his career with a strong sense of accomplishment and a deep feeling of satisfaction. It has been a job well done.

I have the deepest respect for my colleague from Missouri and I know from listening to others that my feeling is shared. I will miss having Dick Bolling as a colleague.

He not only contributed to this Chamber as an active Member, but his constructive critiques and progressive ideas from books he authored have provided a framework for many of the positive changes in the way Congress conducts its business. He has shown that one man with good ideas and strong convictions can make a difference. I wish him a long and happy retirement. God bless you, Dick. We will miss you.●

● Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the Honorable Richard Bolling, chairman of the House Rules Committee, who is retiring at the close of the 97th Congress as the dean of the Missouri congressional delegation to Congress. It has been a truly regarding personal experience for me to have known him as a colleague and I am honored to have served with him during the 17 years I have been in the House of Representatives.

Dick was first elected to the 81st Congress in 1948, and was reelected to every succeeding Congress until the present 97th Congress. He proved himself a capable legislator and fully worthy of the trust and confidence of his constituents of the Fifth Missouri Congressional District. He is a dedicated and devoted American, and a Congressman of outstanding ability, deep compassion, and courage.

Congressman Bolling's diligent efforts as chairman of the House Rules Committee have been both fruitful and beneficial to the citizens of this Nation, and these successful efforts have made America a more prosperous and productive country. He authored two books on the House of Representatives, entitled "House Out of Order" and "Power in the House," which underscore his depth of human understanding and understanding for the elements which give life and spirit to our system of government.

Dick Bolling's inspiring example will be missed here in the House, because seldom does one find a man of his stature, a man so wholeheartedly dedicated and responsive to the needs of the people he served. I extend my warmest best wishes to Dick for a healthy and happy retirement.●

● Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure, honor, and a sense of history that I pay tribute to a most influential Member of the House of Representatives, Congressman Dick Bolling, who—after decades of service here—is going to change careers next January.

When I was appointed as a congressional page in 1953, Chairman Bolling had already served here in the House for 4 years. Never would I have imagined then that I would have the opportunity to serve as his colleague almost 30 years later as a Member of the Missouri delegation.

Chairman BOLLING has probably had as much if not more influence in the House than any Member of his generation, assembling coalitions to pass major domestic programs and serving as intellectual father to the reform movement that has changed this institution considerably in recent years. Frankly, he and I are not of politically or ideologically kindred spirits, but that in no way diminishes my respect for his leadership or his political or legislative accomplishments, and he has had many. We are probably of kindred spirits on matters procedural, in his efforts to make this enduring body functional and responsive in and to our day and age. This work is not finished, Chairman BOLLING, as I am sure you are keenly aware. When you leave this body, I hope it will give you satisfaction to know that there are those of us on both sides of the aisle, even in the junior ranks, who intend to continue to work to reform the methods, the procedures, the rules of this body to insure fair treatment for all; to permit the majority will to be worked while preserving the rights of the minority; and, most importantly, to insure that this body in its relation to the people it represents functions as efficaciously as the term "greatest legislative and deliberative body in the world" suggests it should.

As chairman of the House Rules Committee, Chairman BOLLING has been fair and evenhanded. He has had to make some dificult decisions, but he has never used his power as chairman to block legislation he did not support.

Chairman BOLLING has paved the way for the less senior members to more actively participate in the legislative process. For this, we owe Chairman BOLLING a great debt of gratitude.

I am sure that Chairman BOLLING will be successful in all of his future endeavors, and I want to wish him happiness, good health, and good luck in what will be his new role as a private citizen come next January.

The impact Chairman BOLLING has made in and on this body will long be remembered.●

● Mr. BAILEY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join a number of my colleagues in paying tribute to RICHARD BOLLING as he begins this, his last year of a long and distinguished career in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Throughout his many years of dedicated service, this man has been a pillar of the House and has served as an excellent example of leadership and dedication to the people he was elected to serve. His two books are basic guides to anyone who wants to understand the House and how it works.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the thousands of people in congratulating Mr. BOLLING on such an illustrious career and in expressing gratitude for his endless sense of service, his selfless contributions, and his undying commitment to the people he has served for so long and so well.●

● Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who came to the House with RICHARD BOLLING in 1949, I feel qualified and compelled to say a few words about this remarkable man and his contributions to this body.

Let me begin by saying that I subscribe fully to the idea that DICK BOLLING is a legislative genius. That genius was apparent even in his very early years here and to me, his remarkably wise and often seemingly intuitive perceptions of the legislative and political process were and are simply amazing. But there have been a fair number of very intelligent Members of this House and in my view, it is the character and basic humanity of RICHARD BOLLING that make him one of the very few truly great Congressmen of the 20th century.

We are losing a man who loves the House, its rules, its mores, its character and I think perhaps even its weaknesses. I will miss him. We owe him much and all of us who have served with RICHARD BOLLING can say we know one really great man in Washington.●

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in the tribute to our esteemed colleague and chairman of the Rules Committee RICHARD BOLLING. During his 33 years of service to the people of the Fifth District of Missouri and the Congress, RICHARD BOLLING has been an effective and dedicated public servant.

Over the years of his service, DICK BOLLING has been recognized for his tremendous intellectual capacity. He has been a master of the rules of the House as well as a keen observer of the functionings of Congress as an institution. Many of the great procedural reforms of the House have come as a direct result of his efforts.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Committees, he lead an indepth study of the committee system and rules of the House. As a direct result of his work, many of the reforms of the midseventies were adopted. It is because of his work and dedication that many of our committees now work with a subcommittee structure. We all have to thank him for his efforts to democratize this institution and insure that power is not concentrated, but rather shared.

His skill as a parliamentarian, both as chairman of the Rules Committee and on the floor of the House has been witnessed by all of us. But probably the greatest tribute to his grasp of the parliamentary system under which we work is the repeated faith the leadership has put in him by placing him in the chair during key legislative debates. Not only has he demonstrated his understanding of the procedures of the House while sitting in the chair, but his commanding presence has served to maintain order when chaos would surely have prevailed had he not been in the chair.

We will all certainly miss his intellect, skill, and knowledge of the workings of the House. But probably the greatest loss will be that of a treasured colleague and friend.●

● Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing DICK BOLLING for over 25 years. During that time, I can vividly remember the impact that he had as a relatively new Member of Congress in his early years and how his influence has grown.

I feel the work that he did in his 34 years in Congress has been extremely important. When I was elected as a Member of the 97th Congress, the impact that DICK BOLLING had on the legislative process became even more apparent to me. It was the groundwork that Mr. BOLLING laid early in his career that allowed new Members such as myself to fully participate at the committee level and on the floor in the Halls of Congress. Mr. BOLLING's accomplishments have had a very important effect on the manner in which business is conducted in this august body.

His importance in the leadership of the Democratic Party was a great influence in allowing new members of the delegation to have an opportunity to serve on the committees that they felt were of importance to their districts.

I want to publicly thank Mr. BOLLING for the tremendous help he has been to me and to other Members. I am confident that his influence here will remain while he personally will be missed.●

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in paying tribute to the service of our retiring colleague, the Honorable DICK BOLLING, of Missouri.

DICK is known by his colleagues for his great integrity and sound judgment. His chairmanship of the Rules Committee has been respected and admired by all of us. His perceptive insights and broad experience in the committee's important responsibility will be hard to replace.

DICK BOLLING has served his district for over 30 years, as voice of reason and sound public policy. DICK's experience and understanding of the law have added great strength to this Congress. And above all, he is a gentleman of unquestioned integrity and competence.

My wife joins me in wishing him every happiness in the years ahead. I assure him that he will be missed here in the House.●

● Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I take considerable pleasure in participating in this special order to honor my chairman, colleague and good friend, the dean of our Missouri delegation, RICHARD BOLLING.

Dick Bolling has served his State and Nation well, as a citizen, soldier, teacher, legislator, and even as an athletic coach. I am not certain what kind of record his teams compiled but I would submit that they not only would have known how to play the game but also would be thoroughly imbued with the rules as well. Subsequently, any team coached by Dick Bolling would undoubtedly have more winners than losers.

As a minority member of the Committee on Rules I have found the chairman to be an eloquent advocate of his party's position while always giving all an opportunity to be heard. This comes from many years of service in the House of Representatives where comity is a way of life and the ability to count the votes is absolutely essential to strong leadership.

The publication "Politics in America" noted that during his more than 30 years in the House, Richard has exerted considerable influence over the legislative process of the House. It described him as the "intellectual father of the reform movement that changed the institution in the 1970's." Certainly he has made a mark on the Congress that will endure for many, many years after he has left these Chambers.

I am not certain as to the retirement plans of our colleague, but I assume that following a period of reflection of his work in this body, another book will be forthcoming to join the two he has already produced. And, I would imagine, that the fishing plugs I presented him a few weeks ago will eventually be put to good use. Undoubtedly, we will be seeing quite a bit of Dick Bolling in the Seventh District where our fishing waters are among the best in the country.

We wish for Richard Bolling the best. May his retirement be relaxed and enjoyable.●

● Mr. **ADDABBO.** Mr. Speaker, I join with the Missouri delegation and the rest of my colleagues to honor Dick Bolling, as he begins his last year of congressional service. I learned of his decision not to seek reelection with sorrow, and I look back on his years in Congress with a great deal of respect.

Dick Bolling is a man whose interests have ranged over a variety of areas—he has been honored for his contribution to the fields of law, art, athletics and political science. His widespread interests may be due to the fact that Dick Bolling is, above all, a strategist. He is committed to political process and legislative technique as the essential means to an end, and he has never limited himself to a single area of interest.

Bolling was instrumental in formulating the new budget system, and in softening the existing seniority system. He protected the 1957 civil rights legislation when it was in danger being buried in committee. And, he gave rise to the first vote to put the House on record as supporting restoration of minimum social security benefits—this technique may have been the most important impetus in getting actual legislative change.

Dick has always shown us a contempt for rhetoric over detail. His work to change the committee system and make voting procedures on the floor more accountable attest to his belief in the importance in the way a thing is done, and his expertise in the art of strategy.

The Rules Committee chairman is a strong party man and he taught many of us the meaning of party loyalty. Yet he is individualistic in his approach to issues and always encourages personal decisions in others. Dick is a man of the highest integrity and dedication; he is a perfectionist whose opinions and strategies will always influence me.

I understand that Dick is retiring to write a "modern version of Machiavelli." I think he underestimates himself in the comparison. He is one person whose political advice I will always listen to with a great deal of trust.●

● Mr. **HALL** of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the special order to pay tribute to Richard Bolling, the chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

I have had the honor to serve on the Rules Committee for the past year under the chairmanship of Dick Bolling. Although I am still a newcomer to the committee, I am keenly aware of the many contributions Dick Bolling has made, both the the committee and to the entire House of Representatives. It is an honor and a privilege for me to have served on the committee during his chairmanship.

Dick Bolling is one of those rare figures in legislative history who already is a legend in his own time. Even a new member of the committee like me knows that Dick Bolling is an institution—a man who has made his mark in the House and helped to shape the course of the legislative process.

He has brought to his chairmanship a deep appreciation for history and an enduring respect for the integrity of the House and its procedures. He has always been aware that even the smallest procedural skirmish can have lasting implications for the manner in which future Congresses conduct themselves.

He has treated the rules of the House with great respect, and worked to insure procedural fair play and the protection of the rights of the minority on any given issue. He has loved this institution too much to tolerate the abuse of its processes.

I think it is accurate to say that Dick Bolling simply cannot be replaced. No chairman in the future will be able to duplicate his special style, humor, and intellect. We may have other great chairmen, but we will never have another Dick Bolling. He is one of a kind.

While Dick will be missed by the entire House, those of us on the committee are certainly going to miss him the most. I wish Dick well as he looks forward to retirement, and I sincerely hope that he will stay in close touch with us. His public service may take a new form, but I am confident that his contributions to the committee and to the House are far from over. I hope that he will find happiness and fulfillment in the years to come.●

● Mr. **FORD** of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when Congressman Richard Bolling leaves the Congress at the end of this session, the institution will lose one of its strongest admirers and supporters.

As the chairman of the House Rules Committee, and a true scholar of the legislative system and the House itself, he is without equal. And, he has retained this position of utmost respect while still being true to the ideals of the Democratic Party. The institution needs the Dick Bollings to keep it vital and true to itself and the American people it serves. Dick Bolling's shoes will not be easily filled.

During his 17 terms in the House, Dick Bolling has come to exemplify the highest standards of statemanship, leadership, and integrity. He has paved the way for reform and continually challenged House practices and procedures.

While I have not always agreed with him, I have never questioned his sincerity or motives. Dick Bolling will be sorely missed, and I will be among those who will miss him most.●

● Mr. **BINGHAM.** Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that the first of the many special orders of farewell that will take place this year should be for the purpose of expressing our feelings about Richard Bolling of Missouri. For in this generation no Member has brought more respect to this House.

If it were the custom for a Member of this body to be given a most-valuable-player award, as is done in the world of sports, Richard Bolling would have won the award many times.

Long before I was elected to the House myself, I knew of Dick Bolling's outstanding role. I knew also that he had played a leading part in the fight within the American Veterans Committee to prevent that organization from being taken over by the extreme left wing.

In my first year in the House, I watched in something akin to awe as Mr. Bolling presided, with skill, patience, firmness, and total command of the rules, over the Committee of the Whole during the consideration of the Voting Rights Act. This experience was repeated many times as Speakers selected the gentleman from Missouri to preside when a skilled Parliamentarian was especially needed.

In the early 1970's I had the privilege of working closely with Dick Bolling on a task force set up by the

Democratic Study Group to consider what should be done about the rigid system of selecting Democratic committee chairmen solely on the basis of seniority. From that task force came the idea of setting up a strong Democratic Steering and Policy Committee, which would serve among other things as the Democratic Committee on Committees and which was given the responsibility of recommending committee chairpersons to the Democratic Caucus, taking into account seniority but not bound by it.

Dick Bolling has been not only by all odds the House's leading expert on our rules, but he also has a love and respect for the House as an institution that is, I think, unique. I say this knowing full well that he wrote distinguished books and articles criticizing the performance of the House as a legislative body. His criticisms were never solely negative, but were always accompanied by constructive suggestions for improvement.

It was highly appropriate that, toward the end of his House career, Mr. Bolling should have succeeded to the chairmanship of the Committee on Rules, but it is a corresponding pity that his service in that capacity should be so short. Not surprisingly, during his chairmanship Mr. Bolling has developed imaginative techniques for bringing some kind of discipline and control to the floor consideration of complicated and controversial bills.

I deeply regret that Dick Bolling has found it necessary to retire from the House, but I am sure that his service to the Nation is far from over. I wish him well in whatever he undertakes.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join in paying tribute to Dick Bolling. I want to especially commend the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Gephardt, for his foresight in scheduling this special order in January. The record of these proceedings should provide an interesting reference for Dick as the session progresses, the pace becomes more frenzied, and passions rise.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to serve in the House of Representatives with Dick Bolling. Few Members in the history of this body could match his zeal, his dedication, or his legislative skill. He is a man of conviction who possesses an uncommon ability to translate conviction into useful action.

All of us would like to leave this House with the feeling that our service here has made a difference. Whether it is through a piece of legislation of which we are particularly proud, or an issue with which we are closely identified, I think that most of us hope that we will leave a record demonstrating that our work has been of special value. During his career, Dick Bolling has had a hand in shaping some of the most important legislation of our time. His legislative acumen, as displayed in his chairmanship of the Rules Committee, has earned him the respect of his colleagues. His reputation as a legislator is secure. I believe, however, that the contributions for which Dick Bolling will be most remembered when he leaves the House will be those he has made to the institution itself.

One of the unfortunate byproducts of our frantic schedule is that it does not encourage Members of Congress to give much thought to the manner in which Congress operates. Dick Bolling, however, has never been content to accept the notion that the institution of Congress is not susceptible to change. He has devoted years of his life to a study of the history of the House and the mechanisms by which it performs its tasks. When that study led him to conclude that changes in the structure of the House could improve its operation, he was not afraid to advocate those changes. The House that Dick Bolling will leave at the end of this session is truly different from the one in which he served as a freshman. The most important differences are ones which he played a central role in creating, and it will be by them that he is most remembered.

Mr. Speaker, the coming session of Congress may be one of the most important in recent years. Dick Bolling's wisdom and guidance will be valuable commodities in the days ahead. I look forward to working with him on the difficult problems with which we will be faced as he completes a distinguished career in service to the Nation.●

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Dick Bolling will be retiring from Congress this year. He has chosen not to run for office again, but will instead write a book on power that I am sure will outsell Machiavelli's.

We have called this special order several months in advance of Dick's leaving. The reason is that he is going to dislike the whole panoly of eulogy so much that it is better to get it over with now, rather than spoil his last days here with fulsome praise.

Dick Bolling would not like that because he is a modest man. He is a dedicated fisherman, as I am, and who has ever heard a fisherman brag? Therefore, I know he is modest.

He is, in fact, so modest that the Rules Committee hearing room would not now—nor indeed ever—have a portrait of its latest chairman were it not for the fact that Dick entered into a conspiracy to sit for his portrait as a ploy to get his beloved wife Jim to sit for hers. This remarkable woman, who had no vanity, would not agree to have hers done unless he did. And that is why the hearing room is graced as it is with a likeness of the chairman—casual, jaunty, and exuding confidence.

Dick Bolling is modest, and he is a man with a heart which, I might add, he had even before his recent cardiac surgery. Rumors to the contrary notwithstanding he did not have a heart implant. What beats within his chest has been described as a "solid, liberal heart" by Richard Cohen in the National Journal. I told him, "Dick, if it ain't broke, don't fix it," but he went ahead anyway and became a fellow member of the cardiac surgery club of Capitol Hill.

I wanted to reach for some levity here, Mr. Speaker, because, inevitable as this time must be—for sooner or later, of course, Dick would have retired—it is still almost impossible to contemplate a House of Representatives without Richard Bolling. It is impossible, and painful as well, for Dick Bolling is not only a brilliant legislator esteemed by all of us, he is a loved, close friend of mine.

We might find a clue to what has driven Dick to such extraordinary accomplishments if we look at an article he inserted in the Congressional Record a year ago, a lecture delivered by biologist Lewis Thomas, author of "The Lives of a Cell." The lecture is entitled "On the Uses of Biology," and Dick called it one of the most stimulating and thoughtful statements about our world and our condition that he had ever seen.

Dr. Thomas says:

> I am willing to predict, uncertainly, provisionally, that there is one central, universal aspect of human behavior, genetically set by our very nature, biologically governed, driving each of us along. Depending on how one looks at it, it can be defined as the urge to be useful. This urge drives society along, sets our behaviour as individuals and in groups, invents all our myths, writes our poetry, composes our music.

I think it was truly this elemental and exalted drive to be useful that led Dick Bolling to make an imprint on this House of Representatives that has been unlike any other imprint.

Since 1949, he has applied his 21-jewel mind, his cool, astringent judgement—in the words of Dennis Farney of the Wall Street Journal—to the institutional problems of Congress. His books, "Power in the House" and "House Out of Order," are well known, and an eager audience is assured for the book he will write upon retiring.

He leaves us the valuable legacy of his optimism about the capabilities of Congress, if the institution, as the primary instrument of democracy, can keep itself in tune with and responsive to the needs of the times. He has also warned how dangerous it could be if Congress becomes fossilized, rigid, over-extravagant, or if it puts the interests of a few ahead of the national good.

Addressing the first Workshop on Congressional Oversight in 1978, he forcefully stated the need for Congress to get its house in order:

> If it is impossible for us to perform our function in the House of Representatives, not with absolute efficiency—I do not expect that—but with reasonable efficiency and reasonable economy, then the people are going to get rid of us. And as soon as they get rid of the House or Representa-

tives—in my opinion—we are going to end up with an all-powerful President and at that point we are going to end up with the beginnings of totalitarianism.

DICK has always been the champion of Congress. He has applied his formidable intellect to searching for ways to improve congressional health, vigor, and viability, particularly vis-a-vis the executive branch.

I am not going to attempt to list all his accomplishments; most of them are well known. Structurally, he was the major architect of the Budget Act of 1974. Legislatively, he was one of the driving forces behind the important civil rights legislation of the past quarter of a century.

He is a consummate politician, but he refuses to compromise his principles, one of which is a deep belief in equal rights and equal educational opportunities for all Americans. Perhaps his greatest legislative efforts have been directed to these ends.

During the Vietnam war, he opposed the college deferment for the draft, feeling that the burden of military service was being unfairly distributed. DICK favored a national lottery instead.

As one of the six members of the subcommittee appointed to develop an ethics code for the House, DICK upheld the view, which ultimately triumphed, that a code of behavior for Members should confine itself to standards of official conduct, rather than the all-encompassing standards of conduct. If he had not insisted on this point, the barn door would have swung open to all manner of witch hunts.

I have to return to the lecture by Lewis Thomas that DICK inserted in the RECORD. Our main worry as humans, Thomas says, is how to be single, sentient beings, "fully aware of being aware and, at the same time, the working parts of a social species."

Thomas says that as social creatures we are at our best listening, intently and all together, to music in a concert hall.

DICK BOLLING's genius, it seems to me, derives from his belief that we have the potential to be equally at our best, as the working parts of a social species, on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I think this is so. I also think that if we ever realize our finest capabilities as an organ of democracy, a great deal of credit should go to DICK BOLLING.●

● Mr. CORRADA. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Congressman DICK BOLLING at the end of this year will mark the end of a distinguished congressional career and will leave a definite void in the Congress of the United States.

It is a pleasure to join my colleagues in this tribute to DICK BOLLING, chairman of our Rules Committee, a position to which he has brought the insight of a scholar and the abilities of a craftsman politician as the culmination of his outstanding service in the House of Representatives since 1948. DICK BOLLING has moved, with grace and ease, at the highest levels of power in the House of Representatives during that period. Over the years, DICK BOLLING has lent his considerable skills in the development of legislation that has benefited the Nation, his State of Missouri, and his constituents in the Fifth Congressional District of that State.

As Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and as a Hispanic Member of Congress, I know I speak for my constituents when we bid a fond adieu to DICK BOLLING. His record on behalf of minority groups and in the forefront of every issue confronting the less advantaged in our society is one that will shine many years beyond his departure from Congress.

Missouri is known to all of us as the "Show Me" State, a fact reflected on its license plates and a theory embodied in the adage that if you can convince a person from Missouri that something is true, he or she will be convinced for life.

DICK BOLLING has shown us that you can be a scholar and a legislator, a person with insight into the future and also an individual unerringly diligent in the day-to-day performance of legislative tasks and skills. We wish DICK BOLLING the best in his future endeavors.●

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of statements that have been sent by Members who, unfortunately, could not be here today, and all of them will be included under the unanimous consent request that I just made. There is one statement that one Member asked me to read because of his long and close relationship with RICHARD BOLLING, and he was very distressed that he could not be here today. Therefore, I want to read that statement into the RECORD. It is a statement by the Member from Colorado, (Mr. WIRTH).

His statement says this: As today we honor RICHARD BOLLING, a number of impressions flash across my mind:

My first meeting, when as a student, I heard DICK transmit that characteristic blunt, perceptive fascination with the Congress that I later came to know so well;

Evenings at the BOLLINGS, sharing the quick and learned conversation with Jim and DICK;

Reform battles in the Congress, with so many of us looking to DICK for a reading on the limits to what we could do;

Long afternoons in the Rules Committee Office, hearing of our history as an institution, and the decent and democratic commitments that are so much a part of it;

Our great sense of loss when Jim died, for she and DICK together had meant so much to Wren and me—and she alone had taught us both;

And now the feeling of responsibility that comes to us who stay here. We have been well coached, the tradition is there, the commitment to what is right in this country has been reflected in one man.

We have a big job ahead of us, and we thank you, DICK BOLLING, and we thank Jim, for your great help.

□ 1540

I would add, Mr. Speaker, that I would echo all of the sentiments that were in what I think is a very touching and meaningful statement by TIM WIRTH.

Mr. SKELTON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for his words. I especially appreciate being able to be a small part of this special order for our retiring colleague DICK BOLLING, together with DICK GEPHARDT.

It has been said that there is no substitute for wisdom. We all know there is no substitute for friendship and we have learned from hearing the distinguished colleagues of ours today that there is no substitute for DICK BOLLING. DICK BOLLING is a great Congressman, he is a great friend, he is a great Missourian, and he is a great American. One of the thrills of my life is being able to serve with him as a Member of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S MONETARY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, January 30, is the 100th anniversary of President Franklin Roosevelt's birth. As the Nation's airwaves and news columns are flooded with remembrances of F. D. R., it is best to recall what President Roosevelt did in the field of monetary policy, for our inflation, unemployment, and related problems are a continual reminder of his monetary policy.

Inaugurated on March 4, 1933, President Roosevelt did not waste any time. On March 6, he issued a proclamation declaring a bank holiday and a national emergency. This proclamation also prohibited the banks from paying out gold or dealing in foreign exchange. This was the first major interference with the gold standard since World War I. Eventually it resulted in the ultimate abandonment of the gold standard entirely. President Roosevelt summoned Congress to an extraordinary session on March 9, in order to legitimize his declaration of March 6. The bill to legitimize his actions, however, was not ready on March 9, and the administration could not wait for a bill to be prepared. A folded newspaper was tossed into the hopper of the House of Representatives to serve as a bill until the bill could be written. The bill was then sent to the Congress by the President; Congress passed it instantly and gave the President full powers over foreign exchange and extraordinary powers over the banking system.

But the bank holiday was but the beginning of a list of monetary achievements of the Roosevelt administration which included: First, repudiation of the U.S. Treasury promises to pay gold; second, seizure of the gold owned by the American people; third, debasement of the currency; fourth, deliberate inflation; fifth, deficit spending; sixth, monetization of Government debt; and seventh, confiscation of privately owned gold previously seized by the Government. This was achieved despite the fact that the first three planks of the Democratic Party platform of 1932 read as follows:

> We advocate (1) an immediate and drastic reduction of Government expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent of the cost of Federal Government * * * (2) Maintenance of the national credit by a Federal budget annually balanced * * * (3) A sound currency to be maintained at all hazards.

One day after the passage of the Emergency Banking Act, on March 10, 1933, President Roosevelt issued Executive Order No. 6073, permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations or licenses with respect to gold exports. On March 13, 1933, the Secretary of the Treasury by regulation authorized the Federal Reserve Banks temporarily "to deliver gold in amounts deemed by such banks to be reasonably required for legitimate and customary uses in trade, profession, or art." A month later on April 19, 1933, the Secretary of the Treasury announced that no further licenses to export gold for foreign account would be granted until further notice. The same action was taken with respect to gold already earmarked for foreign account. The effect of this action was, for the first time, to withdraw the support of gold shipments from the foreign exchange value of the dollar with the result that thereafter the progressive decline of the dollar in terms of foreign currency took place.

On April 5, a month after he had issued the decree closing the banks, President Roosevelt issued a decree seizing the gold owned by the American people. Executive Order No. 6102 declared that:

> All persons are hereby required to deliver on or before May 1, 1933, to a Federal Reserve Bank or a branch or agency thereof or to any member bank of the Federal Reserve System all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates now owned by them or coming into their ownership on or before April 28, 1933.

President Roosevelt cited an emergency World War I measure, the Trading With The Enemy Act, as authority for his Executive order seizing all privately owned gold. Executive Order No. 6102 further provided that:

> Whoever willfully violates any provision of this Executive order or of these regulations or of any rule, regulation, or license issued thereunder may be fined not more than $10,000, or if a natural person, may be imprisoned for not more than 10 years, or both.

On April 20, 1933, another Executive order was issued which redefined the export and license privilege. On May 12, 1933, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act was signed into law by President Roosevelt. The act permitted the issuing of $3 billion worth of greenbacks in order to pay off the national debt, and authorized the President to—

> Fix the weight of the gold dollar in grains 0.9 fine, and also to fix the weight of the silver dollar in grains 0.9 fine at a definite fixed ratio in relation to the gold dollar at such amounts as he finds necessary from his investigation to stabilize domestic prices, or in accordance with any international agreement arrived at by the President.

The only limit imposed on this debasement of the dollar was that its weight could not be reduced by more than 50 percent.

On June 5, 1933, House Joint Resolution 192 was enacted by the Congress and signed by the President. This joint resolution declared that any fiat currency issued by the Government would be "Legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues." The joint resolution also abrogated all public and private obligations in which payment was to be made in gold. The resolution provided that—

> Every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy, and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts.

On August 28, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt issued yet another Executive order—No. 6260—in which he prescribed regulations concerning the export and earmarking of gold coin, bullion, and currency, and transactions in foreign exchange. Again, he used a World War I measure as justification for his declaration.

The following January, January 15, 1934, President Roosevelt addressed Congress and asked that Congress enact a law placing all right and title to gold held by the Federal Reserve Banks in the Government. Having seized privately owned gold the previous year, now the Government was to assume title of it in a massive confiscation of private property. Congress responded 15 days later by enacting the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. The act provided that the Government assumed all title to gold coin and bullion in the United States; that no gold coins were to be issued; and that no currency of the United States could be redeemed in gold dollars. The act provided that—

> No gold shall hereafter be coined, and no gold coins shall hereafter be paid out or delivered by the United States. * * * All gold coin in the United States shall be withdrawn from circulation and together with all other gold owned by the United States shall be formed into bars of such weights and degrees of fineness as the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct.

Further, the act provided that—

> No currency of the United States shall be redeemed in gold.

The following day, January 31, 1934, President Roosevelt issued still another proclamation changing the gold content of the dollar, which was no longer circulating, from 25.8 grains to 15.521 grains, a devaluation of 41 percent.

In his speech of January 15, 1934, President Roosevelt stated that—

> Free circulation of gold coins is unnecessary, leads to hoarding, and tends to a possible weakening of national financial structures in times of emergency. The practice of transferring gold from one individual to another, or from the Government to an individual within a nation, is not only unnecessary but is in every way undesirable. The transfer of gold and bullion is essential only for the payment of international trade balances; therefore, it is a prudent step to vest in the Government of a nation the title to and possession of all monetary gold within its boundaries, and to keep that gold in the form of bullion rather than coin.

Amazingly, the two principles upon which President Roosevelt based these actions were:

> (1) Our national currency must be maintained as a sound currency which insofar as possible will have a fairly constant standard of purchasing power; and
>
> (2) The inherent right of Government to issue currency and to be the sole custodian and owner of the base or reserve of precious metals underlying that currency.

Since President Roosevelt took this step to maintain a sound currency, the dollar has depreciated to a minor fraction of what it was worth in 1933. So much for his first principle. As for his second principle concerning the—

> Inherent right of government to issue currency and to be sole custodian and owner of the base or reserve of precious metals underlying that currency.

There is no basis either in fact or law for that principle. It seems to have sprung full grown only from his own imagination.

Senator Carter Glass, a Democrat and former Secretary of the Treasury under Woodrow Wilson, appeared in the Senate in April 1933, although he had been ill in bed, to speak about the administration's money policy. He said:

> I wrote with my own hand that provision of the national Democratic platform which declared for a sound currency to be maintained at all hazards. * * *
>
> With nearly 40 percent of the entire gold supply of the world, why are we going off the gold standard? With all the earmarked gold, with all the securities of ours they hold, foreign governments could withdraw

> in total less than $700 million of our gold, which would leave us an ample fund of gold in the extreme case to maintain gold payments both at home and abroad. * * * To me, the suggestion that we may devalue the gold dollar 59 per cent means national repudiation. To me, it means dishonor. In my conception of it, it is immoral. * * * There never was any necessity for a gold embargo; there's no necessity for making statutory criminals of citizens of the United States who may please to take their property in the shape of gold or currency out of the banks and use it for their own purposes as they may please. We have gone beyond the cruel extremities of the French, and they made it a capital crime, punishable at the guillotine, for any trademan or individual citizen of the realm to discriminate in favor of gold and against their printing press currency. We have gone beyond that; we have said that no man may have his [own] gold, and the penalty is 10 years in the penitentiary or $10,000 fine.

Within the space of a few months, Franklin Roosevelt wrecked a monetary system that had protected the American people for over a century. It is ironic that many succeeding members of his own party have decried the imperial Presidency. Nothing could have been more imperial than the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, particularly with regard to the gold standard.

There was no need to leave the gold standard in 1933. The suspension of gold payments was presumably regarded as part of the banking emergency and, hence, expected to be temporary. The gold position of the Government in March 1933 was sufficiently strong so that there was little doubt the preceding gold parity could have been maintained if desired, just as Senator Glass argued in April. The ratio of the Government's gold stock to the total stock of money was higher than at any time since 1914.

There was, in short, no reason to confiscate privately owned gold or to leave the domestic gold standard. But the gold standard was regarded by President Roosevelt and his advisers as an obstacle to his plans to remake the American economy. Its removal was designed to put the American people into a monetary straitjacket and to allow the Government to embark upon a 13-year binge of deficits and inflation.

The President thought that raising the price of gold would increase the price of all commodities, and it was price increases that he so avidly sought. Now, 50 years later, we are suffering from the price increases Franklin Roosevelt desired.

While there was no reason to leave the gold standard in 1933—except, of course, to loosen the chains placed upon the Government by the Constitution—the Government immediately received a windfall for doing so. Debasing the dollar by 41 percent meant that the Government now had about $3 billion more to spend. Most of this money was put into a stabilization fund that was established to mitigate the damage Roosevelt's prohibition of gold exports had caused, and the remainder was spent on interventionist programs in the domestic economy. In his diary, Henry Morgenthau gives us a glimpse of the President gradually debasing the dollar by choosing "lucky numbers" as the new "gold price."

However lucky this monetary policy was for President Roosevelt—after all he was President for life—it was singularly unfortunate for the American people.

The initial robbery of the gold seizure—which Senator Glass rightly called immoral—has now been compounded many times by the continual issuing of fiat paper currency. Inflation is theft, and inflation has been the deliberate policy of the Government since 1933.

Mr. Speaker, last summer this House appropriated $30,000 more to a Commission that has been trying for 25 years to find a suitable monument for Franklin Roosevelt. That monument already surrounds us: inflation, unemployment, bankruptcies, and increasingly worthless paper bills in everyone's pockets.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt ushered in the age of Keynesian economics and put into practice the erroneous ideas of economic interventionism. Along with this we have suffered the ill effects of international intervention and Government abuse of our personal liberties. The fruits of all these ill-conceived notions are all around us, and New Dealism deserves reappraisal on this anniversary of Roosevelt's birth.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. AuCoin) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. AuCOIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Annunzio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ANNUNZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Gonzalez) is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. GONZALEZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlemen from California (Mr. Coelho) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COELHO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY HONORS SPANISH CIVIL WAR VETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Crockett) is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. CROCKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute some unsung heroes in American history. On Saturday, February 13, 1982, Pete Seeger is presenting a benefit concert at Wayne State Univeristy in Michigan's 13th Congressional District to help establish a scholarship fund to honor the four Wayne students who fought to defend democracy in the Spanish Civil War.

On July 18, 1936, contingents of the Spanish Army and Air Force in Spanish Morocco revolted against the government in Madrid and launched a civil war that was to cost over 650,000 lives during a 34-month period. The rebels represented the Falange, a movement inspired, in part, by the Fascist regimes of Hitler and Mussolini. Dominated by socialists and social democrats, the democratic Republican government had ruled since 1931 after the monarchy was overthrown by a bloodless coup. In an attempt to contain the civil war, the European powers agreed to refrain from intervening in Spain. The then-isolationist United States approved of the noninterventionist policy and, in 1937, extended its own neutrality laws to civil wars. This policy, which included an arms embargo, was unprecedented since legitimate governments had always been able to purchase arms during civil wars.

Italy, Germany, and Fascist Portugal first violated the nonintervention pledge. The Italians sent 60,000 "volunteers" into combat in Spain while the Nazis sent their Condor Legion which soon established Fascist mastery in the air. The Nazi fliers tried out tactics they later used successfully in Poland, Belgium, Holland, and France. In a relatively feeble counter move, the Soviet Union sent money, military supplies, and advisers to assist the Republic. Moscow also helped organize the International Brigades.

Over 30,000 volunteers from 53 different countries joined the International Brigades to aid the Spanish Republic. Among them were more than 3,000 Americans who fought in the Abraham Lincoln and the Canadian Mackenzie-Papineau battalions. Violating their country's neutrality laws, they traveled past suspicious American agents to France from where they were smuggled across the French border into Spain. Seamen, students, teachers, miners, longshoremen, and steelworkers were among the wide variety of Americans who fought for the Republic. In addition, as many as 100 black Americans helped to constitute the U.S. first integrated armed service.

Americans went to Spain for a variety of reasons. Among the complex mix of motivations that led them to join the brigades were: A deep commitment to the survival of democracy in Spain; concern about the containment of European fascism; support for the interests of the Soviet Union; a lust for adventure; and a feeling that their sacrifice might popularize the Republican cause and thus force the democracies to lift their arms embargo.

Four Wayne State University students—Marsden Moran, Roy McQuarry, Joe Rubenstein, and Robert Nagle—joined the hundreds of college students among the American volunteers. The untrained but enthusiastic brigadeers were often used as shock troops on the front lines in those tragically bloody campaigns of the civil war. Fewer than half of the American brigadeers survived, and of those, more than three quarters required medical treatment upon their return. For their efforts, many of the survivors were hounded for being members of a subversive group—the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade—or for being Communists or fellow travelers, or for being premature anti-Fascists. This persecution took place despite the fact that the vast majority of the vets had served in the American military or merchant marine during World War II.

Although Madrid fell in March of 1939 and Spain was to suffer under a third of a century of Fascist rule, the courage and idealism of the Americans who fought to defend democracy has not been forgotten. I join in honoring Wayne State's contingent in the International Brigades in whose name a scholarship fund will be established, and thus celebrate these American heroes whose contributions to the perpetual struggle for liberty and justice serve as an inspiration to us all.●

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Bingham) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. **BINGHAM** addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

(Mr. **PRICE** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. **PRICE**'s remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Swift) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. AuCoin, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Annunzio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Gonzalez, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. Coelho, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Crockett, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Bingham, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Levitas, for 60 minutes, on February 2.
Mr. Weiss, for 60 minutes, on February 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Walker) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. James K. Coyne.
Mrs. Holt.
Mr. Dannemeyer.
Mr. Goodling.
Mr. Fish.
Mr. Ritter in two instances.
Mr. Nelligan.
Mr. Bereuter in three instances.
Mr. Solomon.
Mr. Hyde.
Mr. Winn.
Mr. McGrath.
Mr. McClory in three instances.
Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Duncan in two instances.
Mr. Lott.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Swift) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Bonker.
Mr. Ford of Michigan.
Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Gaydos.
Mr. Evans of Georgia.
Mr. Mineta.
Mr. Mattox.
Mr. Oberstar.
Mr. Lehman.
Mr. Dwyer.
Mr. Applegate.
Mr. Rodino.
Mr. Moffett.
Mr. Bingham in 10 instances.
Mr. Panetta.
Mr. Richmond.
Mr. Downey.
Mr. Hall of Ohio.
Mr. Hughes in two instances.
Mr. Pepper.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **GEPHARDT**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 29, 1982, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2901. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on progress toward conclusion of a negotiated solution to the Cyprus problem, pursuant to section 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (H. Doc. No. 97–135); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2902. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting notice of two violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act, pursuant to section 3679(i)(2) of the revised statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2903. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a list of contract award dates for the period February 15 to March 15, 1982, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 139; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2904. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise and standardize the provisions of law relating to the authority of the Secretaries of the Military Departments to order certain retired and other similarly situated members of the armed forces to active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2905. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize ordering reserve commissioned officers of the Army on active duty (other than for training) to serve on active duty in a grade to which promoted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2906. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, covering the quarter ended December 31, 1981, pursuant to section 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 and Executive Order 12148; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2907. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's sixth annual report on the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, pursuant to section 707 of Public Law 90-321, as amended; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2908. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the third biennial report on the status of health professions personnel in the United States, pursuant to section 708(d) of the Public Health Services Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2909. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a proposed regulation governing the sale of used motor vehicles, pursuant to section 21(g)(2) of Public Law 96-252; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2910. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting notice of the Commission's inability to render a final decision in docket No. 9256, *Joint-Line Route Cancellation on Soda Ash by the Union Pacific Railroad*, within the initially-specified 5-month period, pursuant to 49 USC 10707(b)(1); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2911. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, the tenth annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere, together with his comments thereon, pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 95-63; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2912. A letter from the Federal Inspector, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, transmitting his tenth quarterly report on the status of the system, covering the period ended December 31, 1981, pursuant to section 7(a)(5)(E) of Public Law 94-586;

jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

2913. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting recommendations adopted by the Assembly of the Administrative Conference at its 23rd Plenary Session; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 5383. A bill to give trade negotiating priority to service sector issues and to expand and clarify the coverage of existing trade laws to better deal with service trade problems, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. Zeferetti, Mr. Boland, Mr. Rinaldo, Mr. Fary, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Corrada, and Mr. Roe):

H.R. 5384. A bill to assist in the admission into the United States of certain aliens who have fled from Poland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H.R. 5385. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax benefits enacted during 1981 which provided a special deduction for Members of Congress with respect to their living expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5386. A bill to provide for the temporary duty-free treatment of imported hatters' fur, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHERTY:

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain reserve general and flag officers serving on active duty may not be counted against statutory and administrative ceilings imposed on the number of general and flag officers who may be serving on active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 5388. A bill to provide appropriations for an Agricultural Export Credit Revolving Fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. Hawkins, and Mr. Jeffords):

H.R. 5389. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for youth employment during the summer of 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 5390. A bill to appropriate funds for grants to States for unemployment insurance and employment services; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 5391. A bill to rescind the tax benefits provided during 1981 to Members of Congress for living expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5392. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study of handgun bullets manufactured in or imported into the United States, to determine which bullets have the capacity to penetrate bulletproof vests commonly used by law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARRIS:

H.R. 5393. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present, on behalf of the Congress, a Gold Medal to Lenny Skutnik, and to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike duplicates of such medal for public sale; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5394. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the Attorney General to acquire and exchange information to assist Federal, State, and local officials in the identification of certain deceased individuals and in the location of missing children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 5395. A bill to reform the insanity defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5396. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in honor of the 300th anniversary of William Penn's founding of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5397. A bill to designate the building known as the Old Federal Building in Philadelphia, Pa., as the "Robert N. C. Nix Federal Building"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution proclaiming William Penn and Hannah Callowhill Penn to be honrary citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the support of Congress for the continued provision of full medical service for veterans over age 65; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COELHO:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain withholding taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution disapproving the Federal Trade Commission trade regulation rule relating to the sale of used motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. D'AMOURS:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no new withholding tax should be imposed on interest and dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution disapproving the Federal Trade Commission trade regulation rule relating to the sale of used motor vehicles; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SILJANDER:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution disapproving the action of the Council of the District of Columbia approving the Natural Death Act of 1981; to the Committee on District of Columbia.

By Mr. HERTEL (for himself, Mr. Albosta, Mr. Blanchard, Mr. Bonior of Michigan, Mr. Brodhead, Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Crockett, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Pursell, Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Siljander, Mr. Traxler, and Mr. Wolpe):

H. Res. 328. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that January 30, 1982, should be observed as a national day of solidarity with the people of Poland; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOWEN:

H. Res. 329. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to decrease the amount of outside earned income which a Member may accept, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Res. 330. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Science and Technology in the second session of the Ninety-seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE (for himself and Mr. Dickinson):

H. Res. 331. Resolution to provide for the expenses of investigations and studies to be conducted by the Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 332 Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that priority attention be given to recommendations of the 1981 White House Conference on Aging; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

243. By Mr. BRINKLEY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and designating the Roosevelt/Warm Springs Institute for Rehabilitation as a living memorial to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

244. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Federal taxes on gasoline and fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BROWN of California introduced a bill (H.R. 5398) for the relief of Toshiko Imamure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 444: Mr. Andrews.

H.R. 445: Mr. Andrews.

H.R. 464: Mr. Fazio.

H.R. 808: Mr. Gejdenson, Mr. Morrison, and Mr. Bingham.

H.R. 846: Mr. Frenzel.

H.R. 1522: Mr. Weber of Ohio.

H.R. 1937: Mr. Conte, Mr. Ritter, Mr. Whitley, and Mr. Anthony.

H.R. 2052: Mr. Dan Daniel.

H.R. 2251: Mr. Dellums.

H.R. 2280: Mr. Foglietta, Mr. Pepper, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Minish, Mr. Dyson, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Mottl, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Marlenee, Mr. Markey, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Corcoran, Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania, Mr. Beilenson, Mrs. Schroeder, Mr. Hall of Ohio, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Frank, Mr. Downey, Mr. Fish, Mr. Molinari, Mr. Garcia, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Madigan, Mrs. Schneider, Mr. Holland, Mr. de la Garza, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Scheuer, Mr. Roe, Mr. Hertel, Mr. Akaka, Mr. D'Amours, Mr. Barnes, and Mr. Livingston.

H.R. 2488: Mr. Lehman and Mr. Morrison.

H.R. 4326: Mr. Hall of Ohio, Mr. Dornan of California, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. DeNardis, Mr. Ratchford, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Hyde, Mr. Emery, Mr. Jones of Oklahoma, Mr. Quillen, and Mr. Jeffords.

H.R. 4389: Mr. Kildee and Mr. Garcia.

H.R. 4467: Mr. Biaggi and Mr. Peyser.

H.R. 4509: Mr. Hubbard and Mr. McKinney.

H.R. 4727: Mr. Young of Alaska.

H.R. 4786: Mr. Evans of Iowa, Mr. Wampler, Mr. Collins of Texas, Mr. Grisham, Mr. Fithian, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Wyden, Mr. Bowen, Mr. Donnelly, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Erdahl, Mr. Mollohan, Mr. Trible, Mr. Hansen of Utah, Mr. Ratchford, Mr. Richmond, Mr. Fountain, Mr. Fauntroy, Mr. Hall of Ohio, Mr. Lent, Mr. Florio, Mrs. Byron, Mr. Ireland, Mr. Edgar, and Mr. Atkinson.

H.R. 4810: Mr. McKinney.

H.R. 4833: Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Evans of Georgia, and Mr. Hansen of Utah.

H.R. 4842: Mr. Price, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Trible, Mr. Fields, and Mr. Livingston.

H.R. 4953: Mr. Stangeland, Mr. Sensenbrenner, and Mr. Petri.

H.R. 5001: Mr. Patterson and Mr. Craig.

H.R. 5102: Mr. Evans of Georgia, Mr. Parris, Mr. Philip Crane, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Hendon, and Mrs. Bouquard.

H.R. 5163: Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania, Mr. Corrada, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Zeferetti, Mr. Clay, Mr. Lent, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Mitchell of Maryland, Mr. Schumer, Mr. Won Pat, Mr. Walgren, Mr. Foglietta, Mr. Peyser, and Mr. Fish.

H.R. 5252: Mr. Broomfield, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Oxley, Mr. Dan Daniel, Mr. Butler, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Benedict, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Siljander, Mr. Rudd, Mr. Wortley, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Bevill, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Bliley, Mrs. Holt, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Mollohan.

H.R. 5255: Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Spence, Mr. Oxley, Mr. Won Pat, Mr. Bedell, Mr. Benedict, and Mr. Dreier.

H.R. 5256: Mr. Forsythe, Mr. Spence, Mr. Oxley, Mr. Won Pat, Mr. Bedell, Mr. Benedict, and Mr. Dreier.

H.R. 5348: Mrs. Holt, Mr. Weaver, Mr. Mica, Mr. Whitley, Mr. Moffett, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Frank, and Mr. Bennett.

H.J. Res. 151: Mr. Pepper, Mr. Lott, Mr. Derrick, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Lehman, Mr. Clausen, Mr. Rinaldo, Mr. Fascell, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. LeBoutillier, Mr. Bonior of Michigan, Mr. Edgar, Mr. Napier, Mr. Yatron, and Mr. Derwinski.

H.J. Res. 197: Mr. Crockett, Mr. Fithian, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Martin of North Carolina, Mr. Perkins, and Mr. Snyder.

H.J. Res. 363: Mr. Gejdenson, Mr. Loeffler, Mr. Wolf, and Mrs. Holt.

H.J. Res. 383: Mr. Wortley, Mr. Bowen, Mr. Marriott, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Oxley, Mr. Boland, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. LeBoutillier, Mr. Murtha, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Schulze, Mr. Hartnett, Mr. AuCoin, Mr. Mottl, Mr. Nowak, Mr. Gingrich, Ms. Mikulski, Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Dreier, Mr. Rodino, Mr. Mitchell of Maryland, Mr. Conte, Mr. Howard, Mr. Winn, Mr. Ritter, Mr. Huckaby, Mr. Roe, Mr. Corrada, Mr. Mazzoli, Mr. Kogovsek, Mrs. Fenwick, Mrs. Holt, Mr. Lagomarsino, Mr. Emery, and Mr. Kindness.

H.J. Res. 387: Mr. Fithian, Mr. AuCoin, Mr. Lowry of Washington, and Mr. Bevill.

H. Res. 252: Mr. Solarz, Mr. Roe, and Mr. Danielson.

H. Res. 200: Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Paul, Mr. Gilman, Mr. Shaw, and Mr. Carman.

H. Res. 297: Mr. Dowdy, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Howard, Mr. AuCoin, Mrs. Collins of Illinois, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Panetta, Mr. LaFalce, Mr. Ford of Michigan, Mr. Lowry of Washington, Mr. Walgren, Mr. Stump, Mr. Kogovsek, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Bedell, Mr. Hightower, Mr. Railsback, Mr. Phillip Burton, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Bailey of Pennsylvania, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Ralph M. Hall, Mr. Evans of Indiana, and Mr. Wyden.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

333. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Arkansas Legislative Council, Little Rock, relative to public employment services; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Senate

THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1982

(Legislative day of January 25, 1982)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, LL.D., D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of us all, we thank Thee for the memory of those whose dedication in life and service has contributed immeasurably to our history. Especially today, we thank Thee for the memory of a great public servant and President on this 100th anniversary of his birth.

Gracious God, who giveth to all life and breath and all things, help us to realize the transiency of life. Help us to see that we are always only a breath away from eternity and whatever lies beyond the grave. Help us to hear and heed the wisdom of the Psalmist:

As for man, his days are as grass; as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more. But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him.—Psalm 103: 15-17

Forgive our presumptuous sin, O Lord, in treating life as though we have a corner on it and it is ours to do with as we please. Forgive us for human pride which causes us to ignore Thou who art the Giver of life. Teach us respect and gratitude for this strong, fragile gift.

In the name of Him whose life is the light of the world. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1982.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BAKER thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABDNOR). Under the previous order, the majority leader is recognized.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate be approved to date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I get tons of mail. At the office, at my house, even in my car. Most of it is from constituents and friends; the rest of it is usually junk mail. All the envelopes are addressed to "HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.": Magazine subscription offers for fabulous prizes, free money-saving coupons, and bills for credit cards I do not even have.

When a man who claims that he went to school with a person he describes as "my second cousin twice removed," writes to me for a White House appointment, he addresses the letter to HOWARD H. BAKER.

When my face appears on the TV, a little tag comes on the screen, Senator HOWARD H. BAKER.

Since I have arrived in this Chamber, the Senate has been in session for 2,597 days. I would guess that my name has appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD literally thousands of times.

Anyway, I have just received a copy of the yearend report of the Senate and the cover says that it was submitted by "the Honorable Howard N. Baker." Who is this Howard N. Baker, and why is he writing about the U.S. Senate? I firmly believe that we should have had a Member of the Senate write the report. However, this Baker has done a remarkable job with the report, and if I could find him I would personally shake his hand.

But seriously, in this age of cutbacks and savings to the Government, we may be at the stage where we should start cutting back as close to home as possible. I propose we do away with middle initials. I have not calculated the potential savings, but it could be significant. After all, who ever heard of Ronald W. Reagan, Bing L. Crosby, and Luke J. Skywalker? Let us look on the bright side: If we do not use a middle initial, they cannot get it wrong.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have an announcement to make in connection with the schedule of the Senate and other matters. Before I do that, however, with the consent of the minority leader, I should like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

CENTENNIAL: REMEMBERING F. D. R.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Saturday is the 100th anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt's birth, and we in the Congress are gathering in joint session this week to remember F. D. R. and to commemorate his centennial.

In recalling the unprecedented years of his Presidency, I am struck by one major element of Franklin Roosevelt's legacy—his struggle to make Government the servant of all the people. F. D. R. was for free enterprise, but he found that the only hope of maintaining it lay in the amazing capacity of both the Government and the free enterprise system to change their old methods to meet the demands of new times.

When Franklin Roosevelt was inaugurated President in 1933, the breakdown of the free enterprise system became a matter of crucial emergency. With 17 million unemployed, the stock market prostrate, banks closed down, agriculture depressed, privation harrowing, and panic rampant, immediate and innovative steps had to be taken. Like almost everyone else, I had differences with regard to some of President Roosevelt's policies, approving some, disapproving others. But as to his fundamental aim and achievement, I believe they have stood the test of time. One remembers his indispensable central message:

> Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations—not because the people of those nations disliked democracy, but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity, of seeing their children

---

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

> hungry, while they sat helpless in the face of government confusion and government weakness through lack of leadership in government. Finally, in desperation, they chose to sacrifice liberty in the hope of getting something to eat. We in America know that our own democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need . . . to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people.

A government, Roosevelt said, "that cannot take care of its old, that cannot provide work for the strong and willing, that lets the black shadow of insecurity rest on every home, is not a government that can or should endure." On that issue, I am convinced, Roosevelt was right and will be upheld by history.

He pioneered laws concerning minimum wages and maximum hours, for old age and unemployment insurance, for the ending of child labor, for the insurance of bank deposits, for reducing farm tenancy, for the support of private homebuilding, for the breaking up of utility monopolies, for assistance to farm cooperatives, for the resettlement of farmers from marginal lands, for flood control, drought control, water conservation, the development of Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, and TVA. F. D. R. was an early conservationist, in the tradition of his cousin Theodore Roosevelt, and he was responsible for the protection of areas of great national value, including Olympic National Park.

It was one of Roosevelt's convictions that welfare should be a temporary measure, and that those recipients able to work should work.

As the years have passed, the down side and perils of Government programs designed to serve the people have become obvious—overblown bureaucracies, overconcentration of power in Washington, D.C., runaway expenditures, absurd subsidies, overdependence on Government handouts. But, the cure is not a return to old laissez-faire doctrines and "the Devil take the hindmost." The cure is to move carefully and surely under modern conditions in the tradition of F. D. R., building on its strengths and correcting its weaknesses. Government, properly managed, can be the servant of all the people, not their burden.

In this task, Roosevelt himself has much to teach us.

For one thing, he was pragmatic in policy and administration. It is a travesty to infer, as some now do, that President Roosevelt would still recommend the policies and programs of the 1930's for the issues of the 1980's. Franklin Roosevelt was essentially an innovator, and an experimenter. "Take a method and try it," he said. "If it fails, admit it frankly and try another."

Beyond this, he drew into Government new, bright, competent advisers, surrounding himself with outstanding talent. To the dismay of many bureaucrats, he reached out to special advisers and experts to stimulate the Government's policy councils and to spark new—and sometimes contradictory—approaches. In the handling of foreign policy and the conduct of World War II, President Roosevelt rallied one of the most impressive bipartisan supporting teams of all time—the Stimsons, Marshalls, Lovetts, Achesons, and McCloys.

Also, F. D. R. understood that the administration of Government was only part of the task. Just as important was his responsibility to sustain the confidence and hope of the Nation in peace and in war. He was a superb leader. He had the imagination and will to rally the country and the free nations, and to push successfully for unprecedented efforts. It is the quality of leadership this Nation needs today.

As all of us who talked with President Roosevelt from time to time can testify—he personally radiated confidence, assurance, and extraordinary courage. More than one ardent Republican leader who went in to see him at the White House emerged from the encounter swearing he would never do that again, for, if he did, he would surely become a Democrat.

Roosevelt invented the modern press conference, as a small and informal affair, using it for direct, back-and-forth exchanges with the White House reporters. He used the radio with consummate skill to reach and influence people.

As Vermont Royster put it recently in the Wall Street Journal:

> It's hard to explain to new generations that F. D. R. really did for his country what Churchill did for his at a later time: he held up the people's spirits in a time of trouble. . . . For holding up the nation's morale in those years, if for nothing else, Roosevelt deserves the appreciation of his countrymen.

SENATE AGENDA

POSTPONEMENT OF RESOLUTION RELATING TO SENATOR WILLIAMS UNTIL TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1982

● Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on Monday, when the Senate reconvened for the second session, I announced that I would ask the Senate to begin consideration of Senate Resolution 204, the recommendation of the Committee on Ethics in respect to Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, February 2.

As I am sure we all know, Senator WILLIAMS was the victim of an unfortunate accident and was hospitalized. Surgery was performed shortly after his admission.

It appears certain, Mr. President, that Senator WILLIAMS will be unable to participate in debate on that resolution on February 2, were we to continue with the original plan.

Accordingly, I wish to announce that I will not ask the Senate to turn to the consideration of Senate Resolution 204 at that time; rather, I wish to announce that after we return from the Lincoln Day recess during the day on Tuesday, February 23, I will ask the Senate once more to begin consideration of Senate Resolution 204.

May I say, Mr. President, that I gave that information to Senator INOUYE, to Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, and to Senator WALLOP, the chairman of the Ethics Committee. I have not yet successfully reached Senator HEFLIN, the vice chairman of that committee, but I wish him to know that as well.

Mr. President, since we are not taking up the Williams matter on Tuesday of next week, that sort of changes the arrangements that I had announced previously and that perhaps some of us had planned on. I wish to say that I have tried to reach Senator RUSSELL LONG this morning by telephone and I was not able to do so. I will continue that effort because I know of his particularly keen interest in the matter of Senate Resolution 20, the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules dealing with television in the Senate. Had I reached Senator LONG, I would have said that it is my present plan to turn to the consideration of Senate Resolution 20 on next Monday, February 1.

Mr. President, I do not know how long that debate will take, but it is virtually certain, I think, to take some length of time.

I will discuss with the minority leader, as I have mentioned to him in a casual way on one previous occasion, the possibility of arranging other business to be transacted by the Senate simultaneously with that debate. In other words, to double track during the time we are in debate on television coverage of the Senate.

There are a number of other items that could be disposed of. For instance, the agents identities bill, regulatory reform, a banking bill which has been reported and which is available, recodification of the criminal code, and other matters of major importance.

I will make no announcement in respect to that at this time. The purpose of this statement is to let Senators know that I am prepared to consider and to seek consent to doubletrack during the debate on Senate Resolution 20, relating to television in the Senate.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield before he goes to another matter?

Mr. BAKER. Yes. There is one other brief matter, however, I would like to speak about, if I may.

In order to do what I have just suggested, Mr. President, there is one other matter which must be dealt with. There is an order to commence debate on the Helms-Johnston first-degree busing amendment to the Department of Justice authorization bill on this coming Monday.

Mr. President, for a variety of reasons which I believe are good reasons, and this has been cleared on both sides, I am prepared at this time, if the minority leader is agreeable to this, to ask unanimous consent that the order for the resumption of that debate may be changed over until Thursday, February 4, 1982.

I inquire of the minority leader if that has been cleared on his side?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, it is agreeable on this side, if the distinguished majority leader will include in his order, that there be no rollcall votes on Monday.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am prepared to do that.

ORDER TO RESUME CONSIDERATION OF S. 951, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AUTHORIZATIONS, 1982, ON FEBRUARY 4, 1982

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, when the Senate convenes, no rollcall votes occur, that any rollcall votes that are ordered during the day be deferred until a time to be determined on Tuesday, not earlier than 1 hour after the Senate convenes.

I further ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the order in respect to the resumption of the consideration of the Department of Justice authorization bill and the amendment pending, that is to say, the Helms/Johnston amendment, on February 1 be changed to February 4, 1982, under the same terms and conditions as previously ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Now, Mr. President, I am prepared to yield on matters of concern to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. President, before I yield, there are two other matters.

EXTENSION OF REPORTING DATE OF STUDY GROUP ON THE COMMEMORATION OF THE U.S. SENATE BICENTENARY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, there is a resolution which has been cleared, I believe, on the other side. I send a resolution to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 285) to extend the reporting date of the Study Group on the Commemoration of the U.S. Senate Bicentenary.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 285), which was agreed to as follows:

S. Res. 285

Resolved, That section 5 of S. Res. 381 of the 96th Congress, as agreed to by the United States Senate on August 1, 1980, is amended by striking out "Not later than eighteen months after the date of agreement to this resolution" and inserting in lieu thereof "Not later than December 31, 1982".

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am advised that the distinguished Senator from Washington and the distinguished Senator from Virginia have another matter which they wish to address in the Senate which has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, before the Senator from Washington proceeds, may I say to the distinguished majority leader that I personally appreciate, and I am sure other Senators on this side appreciate, the cooperation and understanding which has been shown by the distinguished majority leader in delaying the taking up of the Williams matter from the date that it was scheduled to have been taken up, February 2, until Tuesday, February 23, after we return from the Lincoln Day recess.

Second, I hope that the distinguished majority leader would be considering some business other than the resolution with respect to television in the Senate on Monday, because it is my understanding that Senator Long will not be able to be here on Monday. I hope that any motion to proceed to that resolution could await Senator Long's presence in the Senate.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I would be pleased to adjust that as necessary to suit the convenience of Senator Long.

In exchange for that, I wonder if the minority leader and perhaps Senator Long would be agreeable to a unanimous-consent agreement that we begin on the resolution itself on Tuesday or Wednesday or whatever day would be mutually convenient.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I would be happy to talk with Senator Long in that respect.

Mr. BAKER. Why do we not leave it like it is, then, and the minority leader can be assured that I will do my dead-level best to accommodate Senator Long. I understand his great concern for this issue and I have no desire whatever to take advantage of it.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESENTATION OF A SPECIALLY STRUCK GOLD MEDAL TO ADM. HYMAN GEORGE RICKOVER

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Thurmond, I send to the desk a bill to award a specially struck gold medal, a second one, to Adm. Hyman Rickover. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk. As I understand it, there has been clearance of that procedure on both sides.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield to me, that matter was brought to my attention. I have discussed it with the minority leader and there is no objection from the leadership to holding the matter at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, is the request for immediate consideration of the bill or to have it held at the desk pending further consideration?

Mr. WARNER. It would be my hope that we could move to immediate consideration.

Mr. JACKSON. We could vote on it today.

Mr. BAKER. We could do it right now for immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2018) to authorize the presentation on behalf of the Congress of a specially struck gold medal to Admiral Hyman George Rickover.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be considered as having been read the second time at length, and, without objection, the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield to my senior colleague, the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join with Senators Warner and Thurmond in sponsoring this Senate bill to award a Gold Medal to Adm. Hyman G. Rickover as his service to the Nation as an active duty naval officer comes to a close. While this Gold Medal will be a token of the esteem which the Congress holds for this great man and his accomplishments, the Gold Medal is just a token because this Nation could never repay the contributions that Admiral Rickover has made to our country. In fact, he is such an unselfish person with such commitment to the national well-being that he has never sought or accepted any special considerations for himself.

I have had an active role in following the nuclear Navy program since 1949 when I was then a Member of the House of Representatives. Since that time, I have been in awe of the excellence and dedication which Admiral Rickover has brought to every task. His commitment to excellence in his work and in the work of his men has created a record of technological achievement that is without peer. I think it is fair to say that we could very well not have a nuclear Navy today if a man of Admiral Rickover's tenacity, genius, and total dedication had not been in charge of the program. Certainly, without his efforts our nuclear Navy if it were to exist at all today would be considerably less credible as a deterrent force in our national defense. With the increasing vulnerability of our ICBM's and our strategic bomber forces, the credibility of our strategic deterrence for at least the next few years will lie principally with the ballistic missile force aboard our nuclear submarines. Because of his unparalleled managerial abilities, the Navy now has 161 nuclear-powered ships aboard which there has never been an accident associated with the nuclear reactors. This record is a monument in itself to this great man.

The contributions of Admiral Rickover have not been limited to merely technical management. His keen mind has absorbed a profound knowledge of all academic subjects, most importantly history and philosophy. He has spoken to hundreds of organizations, testified before a multitude of committees and subcommittees of the Congress and written learned articles and books on a wide range of social and political topics.

His commitment to excellence in education is exemplified by the rigorous classroom and operational training for both officers and enlisted men in the nuclear Navy to insure that they have a basic understanding of the nuclear technology with which they must work. It is a little known fact that Admiral Rickover has instituted many years ago a continuing education program for the seamen while they are at sea with their nuclear ships to insure that they are fully qualified for their jobs. In fact, his educational system is so successful that the private nuclear utilities which can pay higher salaries have hired a large part of the nuclear personnel from the ranks of the nuclear Navy as they finish their service.

While the active duty service of any military officer must come to an end at some point, I have been saddened by some of the aspects of the manner in which Admiral Rickover's active service has come to a close. However, nothing can detract from his unparalleled record of achievement. My personal belief is that he is truly one of the greatest military leaders in the history of our country and, in fact, is one of the great men of the 20th century. The Nation owes him a profound debt of gratitude, and this bill to award him a Gold Medal is one small way for the Congress to recognize that debt.

I yield back to the Senator from Virginia.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. **WARNER**. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to introduce a bill, together with Senator THURMOND and Senator JACKSON to honor one of the Nation's truly outstanding patriots of this century—Admiral Hyman G. Rickover. We do so after consultation with the senior officers of the U.S. Navy now on active duty, and many retired naval officers who support this effort.

This legislation would be a tribute to Admiral Rickover. The bill would authorize the casting of a Congressional Gold Medal in tribute to the man who has demonstrated unique talents as both a scientist and a leader.

It was my privilege to serve with Admiral Rickover in the Department of Defense for over 5 years during the period I was Secretary and Under Secretary of the Navy. We formed a strong bond of mutual personal and professional respect, and I was able to observe firsthand the incalculable contributions this distinguished American made to the strengthening of America's defenses.

In attempting to find a suitable tribute for this exceptional man, we searched long and hard to determine what would be a proper award. On August 28, 1958, Admiral Rickover was recognized by the Congress in a similar fashion; therefore, this would be a second recognition.

Now over 23 years later, the nuclear Navy of 1958 pales in comparison with that of the nuclear Navy of 1982 which has 90 attack submarines, 32 ballistic missile submarines, 3 carriers and 9 cruisers. The accomplishment of expanding our nuclear Navy by so many ships is a most worthy record, and is even more exceptional when you consider that the safety record is unblemished and has never suffered one nuclear accident on board a Navy ship. This remarkable record is a credit to one man, and one man only—Admiral Hyman G. Rickover.

In my judgment, it is only fitting that he become the first individual in the history of our great country to receive a second Congressional Medal in recognition of a naval career that spans more than 63 years.

Mr. **THURMOND**. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor with Senators WARNER and JACKSON a precedential bill that would award Admiral Rickover a second Congressional Gold Medal.

Admiral Rickover ushered our Navy into the nuclear age through his diligent efforts from March 1949 until January 17, 1955, when the *Nautilus* put to sea and signaled her historic message, "Underway on nuclear power."

Since that date he has labored tirelessly to make our nuclear ships the safest and most sophisticated in the world. He has personally interviewed all the officers who have served on nuclear submarines to insure that only superior men serve in that capacity.

Admiral Rickover has singlehandedly guaranteed superior quality in our nuclear ship building program that is so vital to our defense.

Therefore, it is befitting and proper that he be accorded the high honor as the first person to be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal for a second time.

In conclusion, yesterday, January 27, was Admiral Rickover's 82d birthday. I ask that the Senate join me in wishing him a happy birthday.

Mr. **ROBERT C. BYRD**. Mr. President, I have been increasingly concerned over reports that Adm. Hyman Rickover, who is the father of the American nuclear-powered Navy, and whose record in building the nuclear Navy qualifies him as one of America's genuine heroes, is not being given an opportunity to continue to serve the Nation in a useful capacity.

I am surprised and dismayed to learn of this situation, because I had been led to believe that such an offer by the Navy was being made to Admiral Rickover. President Reagan stated in his news conference last week that the admiral was not interested in a job as a White House adviser, but that the Navy would attempt to continue to use his services. President Reagan stated that:

> He's not interested in being just a White House adviser, and I do know that the Naval offer was one in which they truly believed that he had great service to still render, and that he would have an office in the Secretary of the Navy, and a staff, and that he would be there where he could make a great contribution. Now I don't know what his decision has been on that. I would hope that he would accept that, because he could be of service to this country.

But, Mr. President, the Navy has not made him any such offer. The only thing the Navy has offered to Admiral Rickover is an office for 3 to 6 months in order to wrap up his affairs. Admiral Rickover is not ready to wrap up his affairs. Although he is 81 years old, he still puts in 11- and 12-hour days, and 7-day weeks. He is deeply involved in exciting new research on advanced nuclear reactors to improve our Navy's readiness and endurance. For instance, he is currently hard at work in the design of a reactor which never needs to be refueled during the lifetime of the ship. Today the Navy's reactor cores must periodically be refueled, which involves substantial downtime for the ships.

The Admiral was given a clean bill of health by Navy medical authorities just last month. So far as I am aware, it has never been the case that he has not performed in the highest traditions of selfless and talented service to the Nation.

He has been, in fact, a thorn in the side of some Navy contractors when he believed that their work was less than satisfactory, and when they were overcharging the Nation for their work. I regard this fiscal watchfulness as an asset to the Nation, at a time when the spiraling costs of all weapons systems eat up more and more of our defense budget. The contractors are not happy with Admiral Rickover. That is good. It would make me uneasy if they were. But their unhappiness is not a reason to take him off the job. It is an excellent reason to keep him in the program.

I am not suggesting that the Admiral necessarily be kept in his current position. But I find it hard to believe that he can make a great contribution, as the President said, by removing him from useful responsibilities altogether.

The sad truth is, Mr. President, that we are treating one of America's greatest living heroes in a disgraceful, shabby, way. We have been led to believe that he was being offered a job whereby the Navy could continue to use his talents, talents which he desires to offer the country. Such an offer has not been made. Admiral Rickover does not quite understand it. I do not quite understand it.

I have written today to the Secretary of Defense for an explanation of the situation. But time is short. The Admiral's current appointment ends this Saturday. He will be left with virtually no opportunity to serve. Surely he deserves better than this. America deserves better than this.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there further debate on the bill?

Mr. **BAKER**. Mr. President, I have been advised that it may be that one procedural matter has not yet been attended to in connection with consideration of this measure. I ask unanimous consent that third reading and final passage of this measure be deferred for the moment and that the matter by held in abeyance at the desk pending further disposition today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

Mr. **BAKER**. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator RANDOLPH, for his efforts as chairman of the joint meeting to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

F. D. R.'s was a historic Presidency, and I am grateful to Senator RANDOLPH and Congressman PEPPER in the House for giving us the opportunity to honor F. D. R.

Mr. **BAKER**. Mr. President, if there is any time remaining under the time allocated to me under the standing order, I yield it to the control of the minority leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from West Virginia, the distinguished minority leader, is recognized.

THE COMMEMORATION OF F. D. R.'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. **ROBERT C. BYRD**. Mr. President, Saturday, January 30, marks the 100th birthday of our 32d President—Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It is particularly appropriate that, at a time of growing economic difficulties in this country, we step back and reflect honestly upon the legacy of F. D. R.

For this purpose, I would like to quote from a columnist who has impeccable conservative credentials, and from a moderate political publication.

Writing in the February 1, 1982, edition of Newsweek, columnist George Will had to say this about F. D. R.:

> By a "New Deal" he meant, he said a new "concept" of government's duty. Hitherto government had acknowledged only a duty to produce "conditions" in which people could pursue happiness. Henceforth, "government has the final responsibility for the well-being of its citizenship." Government would be an agency for delivering a measure of happiness, defined as material well-being.
>
> Social Security exemplifies how F. D. R. did what only great leaders do; he changed the citizen's sense of what citizenship entails. Social Security expresses the bonding of the generations and the nation's commitment to an ethic of common provision. . . .

Mr. Will concluded his incisive article by stating:

> On balance F. D. R. still casts a splendid shadow forward across the years. Radiating an infectious zest, he did the most important thing a President can do: he gave the nation a hopeful, and hence creative, stance toward the future. To a crippling extent, American conservatism still is, strictly speaking, reactionary: it defined itself in reaction to the New Deal. It remains ambivalent about something the nation is emphatic about—F. D. R.'s irrevocable redefinition of the relationship of the citizen to the central government.

The editors of The New Republic magazine had this to say in their January 21, 1982, tribute to F. D. R.:

> In 1932 the United States was bankrupt in every way. . . . When F. D. R. died, on April 12, 1945, the Allies were on the verge of victory over Hitler, and the United States was indisputably the most powerful nation in history. At the root of that victory was something deeper than military strength. The country had transformed itself, under President Roosevelt's leadership, into a working and workable democratic society, with the means and the will to provide its citizens with a decent life. Did the New Deal 'reach to the heart of the existing system'? Perhaps not. But before 1932, the systems didn't have a heart. F. D. R. gave it one.

In 1932, there was almost total despair in our Nation. From 1929, the year of the great stock market crash, through 1932, national income had plunged by more than half, from $87.4 billion to $41.7 billion. By 1932, unemployment had soared to 12 million, or one-quarter of our national work force. At that time Fortune magazine estimated that 27.5 million Americans had no regular income at all. There were many who questioned whether or not democracy could survive at all.

But F. D. R. gave us hope and action. Again, the editors of The New Republic reflecting upon the times:

> Writing in The New Republic on July 22, 1940, Hamilton Basso, with startling prescience, caught the essence of Roosevelt's contribution as well as anyone ever has, before or since. F. D. R.'s place in history is secure, he wrote, ". . . He emerges out of the fog of a stormy time, as one of the great spokesmen of democracy—giving new articulation to those old and simple ideas which, if democracy is to survive, must truly be weapons.
>
> "He came to the Presidency in a black moment of a black, black time. Democracy, as a form of government, was being laughed at and derided. Many of the intellectuals now loving it so noisily were . . . writing of America as a jungle, America as a wasteland, America as washed-up . . .
>
> "It was then, in 1933 that Franklin D. Roosevelt began to carry the country forward to the modern stage of democratic realization—to the point, that is, where the immediate and direct interest of the government in the welfare of all its citizens is also recognized as a democratic principle."

And as the editors noted:

> That principle, it need hardly be added, is precisely what is under attack on the hundredth anniversary of Roosevelt's birth.

Mr. President, the editors of The New Republic and George Will weave a common thread in their analysis of the Roosevelt legacy. First, is the role of government in its relationship to the citizens of this country—all our citizens. Second, is the reminder of how fragile is democracy. F. D. R. salvaged both the "forgotten man" and our system of government.

The debate in the Nation's capitol, today and in the ensuing months, should not be a debate over whether or not the Federal Government has a role in attempting to deliver, as George Will so eloquently stated, ". . . a measure of happiness, defined as material well-being" to all our citizens. That is, in paraphrasing our Founding Fathers, a self-evident truth. No, the debate which will be carried forward by the Democrats—the heirs of F. D. R.—will focus on the magnitude and nature of this role.

Perhaps, over the years we have erred in expecting government to be all things to all people. But we have erred on the side of the people—all the people of this Nation. Yes, it is a time for reevaluation. Yes, it is time for bold, new ideas and action. But, it is also a time to assess honestly the true nature of our society and our system of government.

F. D. R. led us into the modern age of democracy at a time when democracy was threatened by the dark forces of depression and chaos. He realized, more than most political figures of his era, that if a substantial number of our citizens do not have a stake in the political and economic life of our Nation, that democracy itself was imperiled. And he was so committed to our Constitution, so committed to our democratic system of government, that he was not about to allow that to happen.

America is truly a remarkable experiment in government. We have found our greatest resource to be our people. And we have found our strength to be in the unity of our people. It took us decades to develop a sense of national identity, a sense of national purpose. We must never retreat from this national heritage. We must not succumb to the notion that class should be pitted against class in this country; that region should be pitted against region in this country; that State should be pitted against State in this Nation. Our greatest strength is in unity and indivisibility.

I would like to conclude my remarks by once again quoting from the editors of The New Republic:

> The next great wave of political and social reform in this country, we hope, will understand the value of human capital, not just the kind that buys machines; it will explore the possibilities of democracy in the workplace, not just in the electoral arena; it will look for ways to limit bureaucracies, not just protect them; it will use equity as a spur to productivity, not just as a tool of distributive justice. Roosevelt's America was open and unfinished; so is ours. More important than any particular scheme, more important even than any particular goal, will be the largeness of the democratic spirit that was Franklin D. Roosevelt's distinctive and effortless gift.

Mr. President, the challenge is before us. And I hope that men of good will on both sides of the aisle in the Senate will accept this charge and ask not if the Government has a role in meeting the aspirations of all our people, but how that role can be carried out most effectively.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Bumpers) my time under the standing order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. Bumpers in connection with the introduction of a bill are printed under Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, with the distinguished minority leader's permission, I yield 30 seconds to my distinguished colleagues from Missouri, Mr. Danforth and Mr. Eagleton.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN RICHARD BOLLING

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, at the end of this year, Congressman Dick Bolling of Missouri will retire from service in the House of Representatives after 34 years of remarkably productive service.

Dick Bolling is a man of multiple and creative skills. He is a talented author of legislation, masterful parliamentarian, builder of coalitions, skilled legislative tactician, institutional reformer, and more. If Congress, like baseball, had a most valuable player award, Dick Bolling would have won it more than once in his remarkable 34 years.

There is much to admire in this man—his courage, his skills, his character, his zeal, his dedication. For me, what I most admire in Dick Bolling is his plain, old, garden-variety guts. He never ducks a legitimate cause because it might be unpopular. His dedication to causes like civil rights, civil liberties, concern for the poor, never falters as public opinion polls fluctuate on these matters. He tells it like it is. He is no practitioner of double talk.

Straightforward, blunt, direct—that is the style of Dick Bolling. Indeed, it is more than style. It is the character of the man. It is his very essence.

Of altogether too few in Congress can the same be said.

RICHARD BOLLING RETIRING

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, Representative Richard Bolling of Missouri will retire from public office upon the adjournment of the 97th Congress.

Congressman Bolling's retirement from the House of Representatives will deprive Missouri and the Nation of a consummate legislator, a great intellect, and a good and decent man. He will be missed.

For 33 years Dick Bolling has been an effective public servant as both a national figure and as a vigorous Representative of Missouri's Fifth Congressional District. He is chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is the preeminent Parliamentarian of the House, the acknowledged master of its rules of procedure. He is a universally respected leader of the House. Excellence is his hallmark. He expects others to keep his pace, and it is a tall order.

There is not now, nor will there ever be, a definitive account of Dick Bolling's service to Missouri and the Nation. There are three reasons that Congressman Bolling's service is beyond the reach of any normal accounting.

First, Dick Bolling does his work quietly—without the bluster and fanfare of the ordinary politician. He considers his greatest legislative victory to have come in 1957 when, as a member of the Rules Committee, he played a key role in guiding America's landmark civil rights legislation to the floor of the House. He worked with skill, concentration, dedication and diplomacy, and the tasks required the generous application of each talent.

Today, of course, Dick Bolling is chairman of the Rules Committee—"the powerful chairman of the powerful committee." A committee chairmanship—and, surely, the most important chairmanship in the House—is a ticket to the headlines. Yet, Dick Bolling never scrambles for public attention. He speaks only when a public statement can have a useful impact on the improvement of public policy and not otherwise. It is a mark of his leadership.

Second, Dick Bolling's accomplishments are beyond the reach of a full accounting because he has been doing Missouri's work day in and day out, for more than three decades.

One cannot count the ships guided to harbor by a beacon that has stood for 33 years at the entry to a busy port. Craft large and small, vessels of every description, have crossed the beam. It is enough to know that the beam has shone steadily and with penetrating effectiveness year after year.

Finally, we have come to take for granted Dick Bolling's unique place in the country and in the Congress. We have come to expect the best from him. We have come to expect excellence. And regrettably, what has become so familiar has seldom been the cause for extensive public comment and praise.

Richard Bolling is a person of rare accomplishment. He has fashioned a career of which every Missourian—Republican and Democrat—can be immensely proud.

I respect Congressman Bolling's decision to retire from public office, although I doubt that anyone appreciates fully the void that will be left by his departure.

It may be that Congressman Bolling expects that his shoes will be filled soon enough, that events will roll on pretty much as before, that occasional note will be taken of his accomplishments, that he will be called upon now and then for advice—that the waters will close behind him.

The rest of us know better. Dick Bolling's accomplishments are monumental. He is, in the fullest sense of the word, irreplaceable.

Congressman Bolling says that he intends to expand his teaching and writing activities. He will remain a public man, of course. It could not be otherwise. Nor can a person who sets the most exacting standards for himself fail to find challenge in any activity.

His shoes will not be filled. Events will not unfold as they would have otherwise; people influence history, and great people influence history greatly. If occasional note is taken of his accomplishments, it will be because his contributions stand without need of persistent commentary. The waters will not close behind him, because his position in Congress belongs only to him, and can be claimed by no other.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader has a minute and a half.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. I thank the Senator.

SUPPORT POLISH SOLIDARITY

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, on December 13 the entire world was shocked to learn of an event we had all feared for so long: Martial law was declared in Poland. The grim news of tanks and troops rolling through the streets of Warsaw and other Polish cities cast a dark cloud over the brave people of that country who had struggled and achieved important social reforms and new freedoms. Clearly, the Soviets were the instigators of this repression, and I condemn them for their ruthless suppression of the Polish people.

The union, Solidarity, led by union leader Lech Walesa, had been the driving force behind these important reforms; and it is now the worst victim of the government crackdown. Reports of the detention, beatings, and deaths of Solidarity members have filled the Polish-American community and other concerned Americans with anguish and outrage. Their worst fear, and mine, is that the present martial law may be but a first step in a campaign to reverse all of the successes of Solidarity and return Poland to a state of tightly restricted labor activities and limited civil liberties—that the military government will, by brute force, try to turn back the clock. Such an attempt would undoubtedly bring with it greater violence and the possibility of direct military intervention by the Soviet Union.

Today I wish to express, on behalf of my constituents, a close bond of unity, common purpose, and solidarity with the people of Poland. On December 29, I wrote President Reagan to urge that immediate and severe sanctions be imposed on the Soviet Union for their part in the current suppression. The list of sanctions included a complete prohibition on the transfer of high technology hardware, a further suspension of Soviet fishing in U.S. waters, a reinstatement of the embargo on super phosphoric acid—useful in the production of fertilizers—and an effort to minimize Soviet access to hard currency. Some of these measures have now been adopted by the President, but much remains to be done. In the meantime, we must continue to support a nationwide relief effort through our gifts of food and other needed goods to the Polish people to relieve their personal and family hardships.

With this desperate crisis in Poland, it is important to acknowledge Poland's special place in modern history. Few nations have had their courage so often and so severely tested. Poles have seen their country dismembered, partitioned, looted; their people deported and murdered; their cities destroyed. Yet through it all the Polish people have retained an unbroken spirit. We must demand the Polish and Soviet Government authorities stop the massive and violent action against Solidarity. I again urge our Government to render every assistance to the victims of the present disorders.

Mr. President, I am proud that on Solidarity Day, thousands of Michigan residents will join in demonstrating their support for the oppressed people of Poland. With our proud ethnic heritage, and our history of social justice for working men and women, we will always stand together with the Polish people and workers.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield now any remainder of my time to Mr. Metzenbaum.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I thank the Senator.

LARRY RIVERS AND THE HIRSHHORNS

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, last year Washington and the Nation lost a great friend, and I lost a personal one, with the death of Joseph Hirshhorn. In one word, he was and still is, like the art he loved to collect—monumental, and the loss of this vibrant individual has been greatly felt. At Joe Hirshhorn's funeral, a beautiful eulogy was delivered by the noted artist, Larry Rivers. It was reprinted in the January 1982 edition of Art in America.

At the time of Joe Hirshhorn's death, Larry Rivers was in the process of painting a portrait of Joe and his devoted wife, Olga. The painting is now hanging in the Hirshhorn Museum. The article is a beautiful example of an artist's recollections of an unusual man—but it does not tell enough of the artist himself.

Larry Rivers has been one of the foremost American artists of this century. Emerging from the New York School, he became a second generation abstract expressionist with his style of merging figurative popular images and gestures with abstract painting. Larry Rivers sees himself as an "artist in a drama about the history of art." In that vein, he has also been an artist of historical figures and events. His art includes works on Napoleon, Jefferson, Lenin and magnificient pieces such as his History of the Russian Revolution and his well-known painting, The Last Civil War Veteran which hangs in the Corcoran Gallery of Art.

I call the Senate's attention to Larry Rivers not only to acknowledge this immensely important and popular American artist, but also to share with the Senate Mr. Rivers' thoughts on Joseph Hirshhorn, whose life-long commitment to modern art made dreams come true for many artists, including Larry Rivers. Joseph Hirshhorn was a dynamic person who loved art and by giving this country a museum filled with great art, enabled millions to love it, too. Larry Rivers recognized the great and dedicated believer that Joe Hirshhorn was and he brilliantly uses his talent as an artist to juxtapose reflections on his own life with those of Mr. Hirshhorn. I found it to be heartwarming, inspirational and a fine tribute to a great man and to our artistic heritage.

Mr. President, I also commend to the Senate's attention a January 7, 1982, article in the Washington Post by Judith Weintraub about Olga Hirshhorn. Joseph Hirshhorn had a resounding presence and so does the wonderful wife he leaves behind. The piece is a magnificent, sensitive article which brings home even more to us the tremendous loss we have suffered with the death of Joe Hirshhorn. And it shows that the spirit and dreams he held live on. I am left with great pleasure and happiness from knowing them.

I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joseph H. Hirshhorn, 1899-81

(By Larry Rivers)

(The following text is a slightly revised version of the talk delivered by Larry Rivers at a memorial service for Joseph H. Hirshhorn in Washington, D.C., this past September. When Hirshhorn died Aug. 31 at age 82, Larry Rivers was working on the portrait of Hirshhorn and his wife Olga which is reproduced here.)

Joe finally died on Monday night August 31st in Washington, after going to the theater to see Annie. I say finally because Joe and all of us have been doing a little of this every day. This happened for good, ten days after he left my home and studio in Southhampton. Joe and Olga his wife had just spent three days sitting still for some drawings I made and photos I took in preparation for a commission affectionately referred to as "The Definitive or Final Portrait." You see, I made one of Joe in the '60s, which for all sorts of reasons left me unsatisfied and nervous. He kept calling it Cockeyed-Joe and I kept thinking I've got to do another one, a better one, and soon! As I was writing this and thinking about Joe in Southampton I was also working on the portrait. On his suit, his striped shirt, his soft white shoes and lavender socks that show because his pants ride up when he sits down. And of course his special face. I was also trying very hard to satisfy both my idea of what makes a painting good, interesting, meaningful etc., and what he looks like, how he holds his body, sits tall or small in a chair and puts his arms around his wife.

But I'm here to make another kind of portrait, more like a quick sketch of Joe and Art, or Joe the Collector, at first, and then as his early fantasies became later realities, Joseph Hirshhorn of the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden. Joe died in August, and I'm trying to reduce some 20 years of intermittent experiences into a few words with some tidbits that will be part of the public record. The public record of use and disuse of dreams of glory and of what makes the world go 'round. What does make this world go 'round is a talmudic question. No answers, just more questions. Is it money, or love, or both?

I certainly wasn't against Joe because he had money. But I worried about money my whole life—when I didn't have too much, and even now when I have some. Joe showing up in my studio determined to carry away some half dozen works might have flattened a few wrinkles that were forming and darkened back some graying hairs produced by my financial problems. True, he walked away with paintings for his money, but he was also buying dreams. His and mine. As I saw it, I was the artist in a drama about the history of art. I made the appropriate gestures, I played the role of connector from cave-man artist up to the present. And Joe, right up until he died on a balmy Monday night, was playing just as grandiose and historic a role. If I'm to be recognized in this drama as some kind of bohemian descendant of Michelangelo, Joe all these years was Lorenzo de Medici in a business suit who still liked a Jewish joke.

But death is strong. And Joe's death has produced a shift in emphasis. His recent stay at my house is fresh. In Joe's personal drama, in his fantastic effort to boot-strap himself into eternity, he was the star. A funny, peculiar, energetic and even a bumpy star, full of costume changes; in society, a vaudevillian; on the phone, a financial wizard; in discussions of love, a fatherly advisor; at the dinner table, a devourer of potato pancakes; and whatever else he was in addition to all this, he was the star, and I played the supporting role.

Joe had an instinctual desire to possess; it was this almost uncontrollable desire of his that became part of a process that made the artist's effort in his studio into art. Bringing the art out of the studio and into the world, Joe put the final touches to its existence without ever touching a brush. For everybody knows that what hangs in a collection is art, and what hangs in Joe's collection is even MORE art. Years ago, maybe in 1966 or '67, Joe wanted my large piece, History of the Russian Revolution, which he saw at the Jewish Museum in a 1965 retrospective. He also saw it reproduced across two pages of Time magazine and a few other publications. This is not to impress you about me; it's to show how art came across to Joe. I think Joe looked for art in more books and magazines than anybody I know.

From his point of view—and time has given his point of view the reality of rock—his collection as a repository of artists' dreams had by 1967 been made even more delectable by the strong possibility of the erection of a national museum to house it. In a taxi going across Manhattan, Joe told me that if he could have the History of the Russian Revolution . . . at the right price, he would see to it that there would be a Larry Rivers room in the museum. Your own room, Old Man Rivers! Well, Joe knew he was talking to a pushover. I don't know if I really thought it would happen, but this work that Joe wanted, composed of about 75 different pieces, required extensive worry and expensive care and I decided it had a better future, even if in the museum's cellar, than in my studio. So, into Joe's already choked dreamboat went the History of the Russian Revolution.

Picturing the opening of the museum, dedication ceremonies and all, in the intervening years before it came into being, the promise of a Larry Rivers room seemed more and more a way for Joe to get what he wanted when he wanted it. In my mind, I kept seeing an embarrassing TV news clip. I saw the President, or more likely the President's wife with Joe at her side, surrounded by the press. I saw her smashing a bottle of champagne against the wall of the concrete doughnut that is the Hirshhorn Museum. Now, no matter how much art the American people were getting, this was still a government building costing the taxpayers some 20 million dollars. And in this institution with a Jewish name in the nation's capital and on the Mall, the first art work they see inside is a 35-foot mixed-medium extravaganza celebrating the birth and birthplace of Communism. True, in 1974 Joe McCarthy was dead, but there were still some things sacred in America. So, my imaginary drama went, not only would there be no room bearing my name, they would close the museum the next day! Well, as it turned out, there was no Larry Rivers room when the museum opened, but there was and is Joe's monument, the Hirshhorn Museum. Whether he really intended to arrange for a room for me or not, within the structure of the museum, possibilities existed that lay outside a direct request from Joe. One of the possibilities surely includes Al Lerner, the director. One thing led to another, and now, as you know, there is a Larry Rivers room.

I saw Joe every day for many hours as I worked on the portrait of him and his wife in my studio. I wasn't a virgin when I met Joe, my work had begun to sell, but there's no denying that Joe wanting my work was something very special, and finally important in the art itself. His scope and style and his money and love I'll never forget. See you soon, Joe.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 7, 1982]

Life After Hirshhorn—Olga and the Demanding Lessons of Surviving by Herself

(By Judith Weinraub)

"I must tell you that my husband died in my arms, and my life was shattered at that moment. It is a horrible thing to see someone you love die, especially if you were close, and we were very close.")

It has been more than four months now since the multimillion-dollar financier and art collector Joseph H. Hirshhorn collapsed of a heart attack outside his Kalorama home after he returned with his wife Olga from a performance of "Annie" at the Kennedy Center. Ambulances rushed the 82-year-old Hirshhorn and his wife, who had already attempted to revive her husband through cardiopulmonary resuscitation, to the George Washington University Hospital only minutes away. But at 11:59 p.m. he was pronounced dead. They had been out dancing only the night before.

When the details of his will were released, the public learned what Olga Hirshhorn, his fourth wife, had more or less known all along—that Hirshhorn, the immigrant boy who had become one of the canniest money managers of his time, had left his entire personal art collection, a $5 million bequest, as well as the rights to oil royalties from some of his Canadian holdings, to the Smithsonian for the exclusive use of the Hirshhorn Museum. His original gift to the nation in 1965 had created the museum. His final bequest would sustain it.

The bulk of the remainder of his property—his homes, his Rolls-Royce, his collections of American and English furniture, his collection of Oriental rugs—were to be sold as part of the disposition of his estate. Olga, his wife of 17 years, was to receive a trust fund of $750,000, as well as their home in Naples, Fla., according to court papers in Florida; and she had received many other bequests of art over the years.

"I knew from the beginning he had always made provisions in his will to give everything to the museum," his widow reflects now. "It was pretty clear-cut. Those were his wishes. There were no problems with it."

What was a problem was how to go on without Joe Hirshhorn, the dynamic man whose wishes had been her pleasures ever since they first met in 1961 in Greenwich, Conn. He had called her employment agency in order to find staff for a home he had just purchased there. "I'm not much of a women's libber in the true sense, even though I worked," she volunteers now. "I liked being taken care of and protected. I liked being loved, and I had all that with my husband . . . I did the things that he wanted to do first."

It was not that she wasn't prepared for his death: After all, he was 21 years older than she was and had already survived two heart attacks. But "my whole life revolved around Joe," she says.

These days her life is still revolving around Joe Hirshhorn. Keeping busy with the details of an estate of such magnitude—she is one of its three trustees—has become her daily occupation. "It keeps me from crying in every corner of the house," admits Olga Hirshhorn, a pretty woman who looks like a figure painted by Renoir. By 9 o'clock each morning, she is dressed and ready to start the day, seated in the study that was her husband's, behind the sculpture-laden walnut desk that was his. Her workload is so demanding that she has had to give over her own desk and study to a secretary.

Olga Hirshhorn has a busy and consuming routine—attending to the daily details and eventual sale of the couple's two Washington houses as well as their New York apartment; replying to the mountains of mail she receives; speaking regularly with the staff at Sotheby Parke Bernet in New York, the international auction house which, for a fee, is doing the inventory and appraisal of the art that will go to the museum as well as auctioning the furniture and rug collections; disposing of the contents of the houses; travelling to New York to confer with her husband's lawyers about general business matters.

Olga Zatorsky Cunningham Hirshhorn was, in fact, a businesswoman when she met her future husband. The youngest of three in a Lithuanian blue-collar family living in Greenwich, Conn., she had married her high school English teacher at 18. Mother of three sons by the time she was 25, and worried about paying for their education, she had managed several businesses from their home despite her lack of advanced education. A learn-to-swim group for toddlers had led to a day camp, then a nursery school, a baby-sitting service and finally an employment agency called Services Unlimited.

She met Joe Hirshhorn initially on the telephone when he called her agency to inquire about a chauffeur. She found him abrupt. He found her charming. He also had learned that she was separated from her husband. "He said he was attracted to me by my voice, by my efficiency, by the fact that I ran my own business, that I'd created it," she recalls. "He was a creative man himself, a self-made man. I like to think of myself as a self-made woman."

The Hirshhorn house required a large staff, and there were many phone calls to Services Unlimited. By the second or third call, Joe Hirshhorn surprised its proprietor with a direct inquiry. "Say, Mrs. Cunningham, how old are you?" Then by the fourth or fifth conversation, the dapper, and diminutive, Hirshhorn became even more direct with, "Say, Mrs. Cunningham, how tall are you?"

He phoned for help frequently, "10 times a day," she remembers, and eventually she went to work for him herself, directing the placement of his sculpture collection on the estate and generally helping to separate the Greenwich business affairs from those of the New York office. Two and a half years later, and after her 1962 divorce, they married. "I thought he would never ask me," she recalls.

For 17 years the Hirshhorns enjoyed a close married life. He had retired somewhat from the press of business that had absorbed him earlier, and they spent much of their time together. She shared busy years with him, years when his collection was courted by the governor general of Canada, the queen of England, Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem and Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York; years when he worked to establish good relations with the children of his earlier marriages, and the tumultuous time—tinged with anti-Semitism—in which his collection was argued about and then finally accepted by the nation in a museum bearing his name on the Mall.

In recent years here in Washington, where they moved in 1969, they established something of a routine. After breakfast he would settle down in his study, and she would go off to play tennis. When she returned, it was to lunch with Joe, to work in her own study, and a familiar question: "Did you beat her?" he would ask.

"Our marriage had a kind of craziness," she says now. "We had such fun. Sometimes once or twice a month we would just lie in bed all day. Of course, it would always be on Sunday when the market was closed. We would giggle and think how silly this is. I miss that. Joe was a very simple man. He liked plain spaghetti. He didn't like steak. On his last birthday, one of my presents to him was to take him to McDonald's for lunch."

"And when he was here," she says, gesturing around the walls and table tops and corridors which overflow with his purchases of paintings and sculpture, "the whole house resounded with his presence."

Olga Hirshhorn has no timetable for her own life now. She is surrounded by friends and has not, in fact, spent one night without company or an invitation since her husband's death. But it is hard, she admits, to figure out a direction for herself. "For the first time in my life I don't have a man's arms around me. My children are all grown and I have nobody else to think about but myself. That's hard."

She does, however, have to accustom herself to thinking about business matters. "When I met my husband, I had to choose whether to learn about art or finance or mining, and I chose art," she explains. "As a result, when he died, I still didn't know the difference between a stock and a bond because it was just not important to me."

In fact, one of the first things that she did, almost automatically, after her husband's death was to cancel The Wall Street Journal. When the other executors told her she had to get involved in the business aspect of the estate, she groaned and said that she didn't even know how to find out the interest rates. She recalls their command with a smile. "It's all in The Wall Street Journal, so get it back."

Two days before Hirshhorn's death, his wife had had "the first and last and only lesson in finance that Joe gave me," she says. Her mother had died, and she was anticipating a small inheritance. She wanted to know what he thought she should do with the money. "First Joe said, 'Put it in a money market fund,'" she recalls, relishing the irony of the story. "Then he said, 'No, put it in tax-free bonds.' I said, 'I thought you didn't believe in bonds,' and he said, 'You know, there comes a time when you change your mind about things like that. I'll tell you what I'm buying . . .'"

At that point the phone rang. "Now," she says, "I've learned about treasury bills and notes, and bonds, and government funds. But not from Joe, who could have told me everything I needed to know. Now I'm learning to read the reports myself."

If Joe Hirshhorn didn't actually imbue her with his business principles, some of his attitudes seem to have rubbed off. On a recent morning, dressed in a white blouse, light blue trousers, a matching blue cashmere cardigan, and espadrilles, she fielded phone calls from all over the country and Canada. As she efficiently ticked off the day's responsibilities, some of her husband's no-nonsense approach was evident in her conversations. She explained to a senator that he could have her support for a project, but not here financial support. She succeeded in completing the sale of a valuable and cherished piano in order to "stop bickering." She graciously refused a luncheon invitation she could not fit into her schedule, and joked that a widow would rather be invited to dinner.

Her manner was as polite and winning as ever, but her words left no doubt that she is developing an instinct for her task:

"That's half of one percent off the top. Joe would never have let him get away with that. Why should we," she complained to a colleague about a fee.

"I'm the buyer. You're the seller. You should come to see me," she explained, with delight at that particular discovery, to a real estate agent who was trying to interest her in a house.

Has she picked up any of his style? "No, although I suppose being exposed to him, you develop a hard-line attitude. And we are trying not to get rid of things too cheaply. I bargain hard even though I get no personal gain. I am afraid people will take advantage of me because of my inexperience.

"And I'm learning a lot. It keeps me busy. It doesn't give me a chance to cry."

Quietly stoking the fire in her husband's study, the fire that he loved to watch, she says she wishes they had spoken about the future. The only discussion they had involved his wish to be buried in a plain pine box, in accordance with Jewish tradition. But when it came to choosing the coffin, his widow, who herself converted to Judaism in 1973, was dismayed. For Joe Hirshhorn, she laughs. "They were really plain."

And the closest they every got to discussing her future without him was his joking that after he died, "Olga will find two 40s for one 80."

"He was fine," she says, thinking back a few months. "He thought he was going to live forever.

"So did I."

WAS STOCKMAN THE VICTIM?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, much has been said and written about the now famous interview with Budget Director David Stockman in the Atlantic Monthly.

The comment has ranged from criticism of the Budget Director for talking to a reporter all the way to a remark from the President himself that intimated that the writer was guilty of a form of "assassination."

At the very least, the article has caused a great deal of embarrassment for Mr. Stockman and the administration.

Recently, Thomas Vail, publisher and editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, cast another light on the subject in a signed editorial page column.

Mr. Vail theorizes that Mr. Stockman, instead of being a culprit, was, in effect, a victim—a victim of the President's decision that there be no meddling with either the defense budget or with social security. Once that decision was made, Mr. Vail ventures the opinion that—

> Stockman realized his budget balancing program not only was impossible to attain, but worse, that the United States is headed for the largest deficit in its history. So Stockman threw in the towel not on the Reagan economic program as he conceived it but on the realities of the situation as they developed.

Mr. President, as matters have turned out, it appears that this is an incisive view of what has really happened within the administration. I urge my colleagues to read the Vail column.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column by Thomas Vail in the December 6, 1981, edition of the Cleveland Plain Dealer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOCKMAN MEANT HE WAS THE VICTIM

We have been treated in the media recently with the dramatic "revelation" that the chief architect of the Reagan economic program says the whole thing is a lot of baloney. All this headline-making material came from a very interesting, comprehensive and lengthy story in the Atlantic Monthly, "The Education of David Stockman."

The newspaper version of this story indicated that Stockman, head of the Office of Management and Budget, at the young age of 36 had given up on the Reagan program and was saying the thing would not work.

However, this observer after reading the article itself in the Atlantic Monthly comes up with a different interpretation of what this rather sensational story is all about. What the Atlantic Monthly article says, in my opinion, is that Stockman of the OMB had his game plan to put the American economic house in order derailed by others.

This Stockman game plan consisted of substantial reductions in government spending, some reduction in personal and corporate taxes, some reforms and belt tightening for the Social Security system, and a containment of military spending. This way Stockman thought he could come up with a balanced budget in the next couple of years, a goal President Reagan campaigned on in 1980.

According to the story in the Atlantic Monthly, Stockman only gave up on balancing the federal budget because the president cut him off at the pass.

This is the "derailing" sequence as outlined by the author of the article, William Greider, who is an assistant managing editor of the Washington Post:

First, the reductions the Reagan administration achieved in government spending were not reductions in current government spending but were reductions from the inflated "wish list" or projections of what government spending "might be" next year. Therefore, the cuts in government spending that President Reagan brought about are reductions from figures that were inflated and partly fantasy in the first place.

The second derailment of Stockman started when the Democratic House majority members decided they would exceed the tax cutting of the Republicans. The Democratic party reasoned that if the Republicans were going to please the voters with tax cutting, then the Democrats would double the goodies and get more credit from the voters. In the process the Democratic majority in the House cut taxes too much and opened more loopholes even for the already taken care of oil business.

Then, according to the Atlantic Monthly article, the worst was yet to come for Stockman. Looking at the rather small real government spending reductions and the too large personal and corporate tax reductions, Stockman knew that he would have to cut back military spending and Social Security costs or the federal budget would be wildly out of balance.

According to the Atlantic Monthly article, when Stockman made his argument on the military budget and the cost of Social Security, President Reagan was adamant that there be no meddling with an increased military budget or with Social Security.

Adding up the situation on his computer, Stockman realized his budget balancing program not only was impossible to attain, but worse, that the United States is headed for the largest deficit in its history. So Stockman threw in the towel not on the Reagan economic program as he conceived it but on the realities of the situation as they developed.

I suspect that, seeing a budget disaster, Stockman himself authorized his reporter friend to use the story. Stockman's subsequent loss of credibility was primarily because the article reported he continued to try to sell an economic program to Congress after he had figured out the program—as it had developed—would not work.

The only postscript that can be written about all this is a comment on the present effect of the budget debacle. Wall Street financial people, seeing that the Stockman balanced budget economic plan has been decimated, are showing a lack of confidence in the financial plans of the Reagan administration. Huge government budget deficits are bad news for Wall Street.

The only economic "way out" now for President Reagan is to make a deal with the Soviet Union on arms reductions so the massive U.S. military budget can be reduced. The chance of making a deal with the Russians is good because of the economic collapse of Poland, military difficulties in Afghanistan and a disastrous year for Russian agriculture.

So the good news is that the Americans and the Russians are meeting, this time publicly in Geneva, and that for both sides an arms reduction deal may not only be desirable but also a necessity.

THE 64TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, this week, Ukrainian Americans will gather in cities and towns across the country to observe the 64th anniversary of the Ukraine's declaration of independence. In doing so, they will renew their commitment to preserving their rich culture here in America. And at the same time, they will rededicate themselves to strengthening the bonds that exist between the 2 million Americans of Ukrainian heritage and the 50 million people of the Ukraine.

This commemoration is an occasion for sadness—sadness because the independence that was proclaimed in the ancient city of Kiev on January 22, 1918, could not for long survive in the face of Soviet power.

It is an occasion to remind Americans of the great suffering that the Ukrainian people have endured under Soviet rule.

Millions of Ukrainian lives were lost in the early 1930's, when Stalin's collectivization of agriculture led to one of this century's most devastating famines. And even while those millions were dying in the Ukraine, Stalin was exporting the food he extracted from them in order to pay for his imports of heavy industrial equipment.

For more than half a century, the Soviet Government has spared no effort to russify the Ukrainians, to root out their distinctive culture, and to suppress their religious faith.

But, Mr. President, the Soviets have not succeeded. And in spite of decades of suffering and repression, the Ukraine has produced some of the real heroes and heroines of the human rights movement.

Consider for a moment what it means to be a human rights activist in the Soviet Union.

At the very least, it means loss of employment and educational opportunity for oneself and one's family.

It means tapped telephones, opened mail, and visits by the KGB.

For Valentyn Moroz, a distinguished Ukrainian historian now living in freedom here in America, it meant years in prison. And it also meant commitment to psychiatric hospitals and treatment with dangerous drugs and chemicals.

For Mykola Rudenko, a member of the group established in the Ukraine to monitor Soviet compliance with the Helsinki accords, it meant arrest, a ludicrous trial, and a 12-year sentence—7 years at hard labor, followed by another 5 years of exile in Siberia.

Rudenko, who is 62 years of age, is a poet, a philosopher, and a severely wounded combat veteran of the Second World War. What was his crime? He was convicted of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" for asking the Soviet Government to honor its own solemn word, that it would observe the human rights provisions of the Helsinki accords. It is no crime in the Soviet Union for the government to promise such things. It is a crime only when a Soviet citizen asks the government to live up to its promises.

In April of 1981, the Rudenko family received another object lesson in the value of Soviet promises when Raisa Rudenko, the poet's wife, was arrested for smuggling her husband's poetry. She was sentenced in September of last year to a 3-year prison term.

Can one imagine, Mr. President, a country that puts people in jail for smuggling poetry?

Can one imagine a regime so insecure, so paranoid, and so terrified of its own people that it treats the words of a poet as a danger to public safety?

I think it is difficult for we who are accustomed to freedom to fully comprehend the courage of people like the Rudenkos, like the Jewish activists Shcharansky and Nudel, the Lithuanian Catholic leaders Petkus and Gajauskas, and Helsinki monitors in Moscow, Kiev, and elsewhere in the Soviet Union.

I believe, Mr. President, that we have a moral obligation to turn our attention once again to the cause of human rights in the Soviet Empire.

I know that the expression "human rights" is held today in low repute.

We have heard it said that the status of human rights in foreign nations is none of America's business. The Soviet Union, we are told, considers this an internal matter, and the Soviets are very sensitive about our criticism.

Well, I am sorry to hear that the Soviet leaders are sensitive.

But I want the Soviets to know that Americans are sensitive too.

Americans are sensitive and Americans get angry when we hear that people like Valentyn Moroz have been confined to mental hospitals and subjected to mind-altering drugs.

We are sensitive and angry when we hear that tens of thousands of Soviet Jews have been denied the right to emigrate to Israel.

We are sensitive and angry when we read that people like the Rudenkos have been jailed for slandering the Soviet state.

That is quite a trick, slandering the Soviet state.

How can you slander the state that sent its army into a harmless neighboring country like Afghanistan? That they did it at all is slander enough.

What kind of slander of the Soviet regime could match the facts of what has been done at Soviet instigation to the working men and women of Poland?

If it is a crime in the Soviet Union to make that country look absurd, then let them put the judges in these human rights cases on trial. Let them haul Mr. Brezhnev into the dock. Let them try the secret police, the informers, and the Communist Party officials who are so frightened, so insecure in their moral claim to power, that they earn for their country the contempt of the world.

The Soviet Government may suppress individuals. But even the KGB cannot kill the idea of liberty.

Make no mistake about it—the idea of liberty is loose in the Soviet Empire today.

I do not say that major changes are about to take place.

The people of Poland can testify about how the Soviets respond to the possibility of change.

However, I do think that the example of solidarity in Poland and the existence of dissidence in the Soviet Union give evidence of a deep unease in the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. This unease stems from a desire on the part of millions of people there for a better life, for more freedom, for the right to practice religion, and to honor a national heritage.

Because I believe these things, I reject the counsel of those who think that our country should back from its commitment to speak out on behalf of human rights.

I reject the idea that we should stop bothering the Soviet authorities with demands about the liberties guaran teed to their citizens by the Helsinki accords and the universal declaration of human rights.

I believe that we should bother them, that we should bother them as often and as forcefully as we can.

On an occasion like this anniversary, I believe that Americans of every ancestry should stand shoulder to shoulder with their friends and neighbors in the Ukrainian American community. Only by knowing what others have lost can we understand the true value of our American freedom.

F. D. R. AND THE SAFETY NET

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt made his run for the Presidency in 1932, he was quite clear about what needed to be done to pull this country out of the Great Depression and save it from total collapse. In a radio address in April 1932, 3 months before he won the nomination, he said:

> These unhappy times call for the building of plans * * * that build from the bottom up and not from the top down, that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid.

This was not campaign rhetoric. It was a vision of what should be, and the beginnings of a plan for what would be. It was based on the view that common men and women, their families, and their intelligence, work ethic, and inherent goodness are the bedrocks on which this Nation rests. He saw in the Depression the results of an economic and political system operating on the principles of greed and the almost total absence of regulation, and the inability of Government to protect the people from its worst affects. As he later stated—in his second inaugural address, January 20, 1937:

> We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics.

He ran on a progressive platform that called for the Government to meet its responsibilities to see that the basic needs of all Americans were met, that both rich and poor alike would be treated with fairness, and that economic safeguards would be established to prevent another Great Depression from occurring. In today's jargon, what F. D. R. promised to do was to use the positive power of government to create an economic safety net for the first time in U.S. history.

He carried his message to the people, visiting 38 States during his campaign. The response was overwhelming. F. D. R. defeated Herbert Hoover by a popular majority of 7 million votes, and an electoral vote of 472 to 59, as he carried all but six States.

When F. D. R. took office in March of 1933, some 15 million industrial laborers were out of work, the bottom had fallen out of the agricultural markets, people were losing their houses because they did not have any money to pay their mortgages, and the entire financial system was jeopardized by a major run on banks all over the country. It was in this context that he made his famous first inaugural address, in which he told the Nation that "All we have to fear is fear itself."

He was right, of course. With the full support of Congress in that remarkable hundred days extra session in the spring of 1933 the New Deal was launched, and the political and economic foundations for the next 50 years of American history were set. True to his word, F. D. R.'s New Deal benefited all Americans. In that initial batch of New Deal legislation, there was the Agricultural Adjustment Act to help farmers, the National Labor Relations Act for industrial workers, and the National Industrial Recovery Act to assist businessmen. Over time, F. D. R. and Congress systematically attacked the fundamental problems besetting America. It is a tribute to their sensitivity and wisdom that so much of the legislation they passed and so many of the institutions they created are as relevant today as they were five decades ago: Social security, the National Labor Relations Board, TVA, soil conservation programs, rural electrification, insurance on bank deposits, farm price supports, and the others that are now considered essential duties and functions of Government.

Today, there are those who would rip out vital cords from the safety net so painstakingly woven by Franklin Roosevelt and Congress, and which has supported successive generations of Americans. For the first time in 50 years, questions are being seriously raised about the obligation of government to insure the well-being of all Americans, and to see that all citizens are treated fairly in their political and economic dealings. Those of us who see a need for the continued defense of the rights of working people, and who fight against legislation and policies designed to increase the inequities in the American system, can strengthen our resolve by remembering the following passage from F. D. R.'s second inaugural address:

> The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

Mr. President, I hope that we in Congress will use the occasion of FDR's centenary to reflect on the American system as it really was before he took office, and to ask ourselves if the Nation's interests would be served if the current administration succeeds in dismantling the safety net he created. My own view is that in the vain hope of somehow returning to good old days that never were, the administration is threatening the economic, political, and social fibers that have provided so much strength and vibrance to this society over the last 50 years.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

THE DESIGNATION OF THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY TIGER FOOTBALL TEAM AS 1981 NATIONAL COLLEGE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on New Year's Day 1982, the "Tigers" of Clemson University, my alma mater in South Carolina, concluded a perfect football season with a magnificent victory over the powerful and highly regarded "Cornhuskers" of the University of Nebraska. This final victory of the season earned the Tigers the 1981 National College Football Championship.

This was a history-making event, and one in which all those associated with Clemson, as well as all South Carolinians, can take great pride. Considering the fact that Clemson University has a total student enrollment of less than 12,000, this accomplishment is especially noteworthy, for it places Clemson in the same category with Alabama, Nebraska, Notre Dame, Pittsburgh, Georgia, and others whose reputations for such athletic accomplishments are so well-established. Who would have thought, at the beginning of the 1981 football season back on September 5, that the Tigers of Clemson would capture the national title? After all, they faced some formidable opponents, including the defending national champion Georgia Bulldogs.

Some say that it all started when the Tigers moved into the top 20 after their victory over Georgia in their third game. Even then many found it too much to hope for that the Clemson Tigers could go the distance undefeated—but not the players or their coaches. As head coach Danny Ford later stated in an interview during October,

> There's not a whole lot of folks out there who have ever heard of Clemson. But these youngsters believe in themselves. They've won seven and they can win five more. Sometimes, I ask myself, "Can it really all come true?" Then I just nod my head and say, "It sure can."

Near the stroke of midnight on January 1, 1982, it did—for an undaunted Tiger football team, a committed coaching staff, and a band of loyal Clemson fans the likes of which probably have never before been seen in the Orange Bowl. The final score was Clemson 22, Nebraska 15, and the record of the Tigers was an unblemished 12 and 0 for the season.

To the pleasure of Clemson fans everywhere and the people of South Carolina, a headline on the sports page of the Washington Post on Sunday, January 3, 1982, proclaimed the Clemson Tigers the "unbeaten and undeniable National Champions."

It is not enough to pay tribute to Clemson in an abstract way for this accomplishment. A great deal of hard work, tedious training, dedicated support, and detailed planning went into this season, as well as seasons past, and I would be remiss if I did not place the credit more precisely where it is due.

First of all, it could not have happened without the sacrifices and the commitment of the players. No team ever played with more confidence in themselves or greater determination than this group of outstanding young men. Each one is to be congratulated for a maximum effort and for achieving the ultimate reward. In particular, I wish to commend Homer Jordan, Tiger quarterback, who was named "Outstanding Player in the Orange Bowl" and who led the Tigers on the field to their 12 wins. I also wish to commend Jeff Davis, who was selected the "Outstanding Defensive Player of the Orange Bowl Game" and, earlier, was named "Atlantic Coast Conference Player of the Year."

Of course, it takes a superior head coach and coaching staff to put together such a winning combination. Danny Ford has had a short career as head coach at Clemson. His first game as head coach was the 1978 Gator Bowl game against Ohio State. Clemson won that game by a score of 17 to 15. This certainly was a great way to begin a career as head coach—with a bowl victory against such a perennial power as the Ohio State "Buckeyes."

In 3 short years, Coach Ford has proven himself to be a winner. His record is now 27 and 9, including three bowl appearances. These are rare accomplishments for a young man 33 years of age. However, let me not fail to mention the sources of his inspiration—namely, his lovely wife, Deborah, and their three pretty daughters, Ashleigh, Jennifer, and Mary Elizabeth.

Danny Ford has been fortunate in another respect. He follows in the tradition of Frank Howard, a great head coach at Clemson for many years, a good friend of mine, and a Clemson institution in himself. Coach Ford also has been fortunate to work under athletic director Bill McLellan, who first joined the Clemson athletic staff in 1958 as an assistant football coach after receiving his degree there and lettering in football. Over the years, Bill has advanced through the ranks to become only the third athletic director in the history of Clemson. Under his very able leadership, the all-around sports program at the university has been ranked in the top 30 nationally each of the past 5 years, including 2 finishes in the top 5.

Finally, Coach Ford has had the benefit of outstanding talent and football savvy in the corps of assistant coaches he has assembled, and in the athletic department staff, which includes the trainers, who work under the expert supervision of Fred Hoover, the managers and student trainers, and the men and women who attend to the administrative details of the athletic program.

To make the entire program work effectively, however, everyone recognizes the need for the support of the university officials, and in this respect, I must single out the superior leadership given Clemson athletically, as well as academically, by the board of trustees, which is chaired by Tom McTeer, Jr., and by the president of Clemson University, Dr. Bill Atchley. Athletics at Clemson are well balanced with academics, and rightfully so. The credit for creating and maintaining an atmosphere where the young people who attend this fine institution can reach their potential in such a balanced fashion goes to the members of the board, Dr. Atchley, and the outstanding group of executive officers, deans, faculty, and staff that they have assembed at Clemson.

As an alumnus of Clemson, I take special pride in the enthusiasm of the students and their accomplishments on all fronts. Clemson University is known for the loyalty of her students, not only on Saturday afternoons in Death Valley, the name given to the football stadium, but to her tradition of excellence in academics and in other fields of endeavor. Clemson students have every reason to be proud of this particular recognition, as well as the reputation the university has earned in other fields too numerous to specify here. The students were in Miami, and they were there in force. They were there to cheer the Tigers on, and they will never forget that final victory of the season in the Orange Bowl on New Year's night.

In this respect, I wish to commend the outstanding contributions made to the spirit of Clemson fans through the season by the performances of the Tiger Band, under the very talented direction of Dr. Bruck Cook and his assistant, Rod Harkins. I also wish to commend the Tiger cheerleaders and their captain, Mark Barhyte. Special recognition is also due Ricky Capps, the "Tiger," whose playful antics throughout the season were a source of amusement and inspiration to so many thousands of spectators.

In addition to the continuing and unwavering support that the students and others on campus give to the athletic program at Clemson, there is a well-organized and dedicated group of supporters among the alumni of the university. IPTAY, the "I-Pay-Ten-A-Year" Club, was established in 1934 for the purpose of providing athletic scholarships for Clemson's student athletes. IPTAY recently was named the No. 1 athletic scholarship organization in the United States. IPTAY, of course, does much more than provide athletic scholarships; it assists the university financially in making capital improvements in athletic facilities for both intercollegiate and intracollegiate sports events and programs and contributes to numerous other activities of the university. Currently, IPTAY boasts of 15,000 members. I commend them and their leaders for their worthwhile efforts on behalf of Clemson.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the mothers, fathers, and family members of all those young men and women who, in various ways, contributed to this unique moment in the history of Clemson University. If any of us associated with Clemson have a right to feel proud, then they certainly do. They have made it all possible.

I wish to extend my compliments to our distinguished colleagues from Nebraska, Senators EXON and ZORINSKY, and also to Senator ABDNOR, a graduate of the University of Nebraska. Clemson simply could not have played a team in the Orange Bowl with a finer reputation and richer football tradition than the "Big Red." Having been in the stands to witness this tremendous game, I now understand the great pride that they take in this magnificent institution of higher learning and its outstanding football team.

In conclusion, let me express my appreciation to Senators HAWKINS and CHILES, our distinguished colleagues from Florida, for the warm welcome accorded fans of Clemson and Nebraska by the people of Florida and the city of Miami, in particular. Special thanks are due the members of the Orange Bowl committee for the superior job of planning that they did for this year's event. The Orange Bowl, the Orange Parade, and the related events made the visit to Miami by Clemson fans and Nebraska fans alike a memorable one. I commend all those associated with this annual event and wish them well in the years ahead.

By proclamation of the Governor and General Assembly of South Carolina, Thursday, January 21, 1982, through Thursday, January 28, 1982, was designated "Clemson Tigers' No. 1 week" in South Carolina, and the football team and Clemson University were honored throughout the State for their winning of the 1981 National College Football Championship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of those persons instrumental to this accomplishment be placed in the RECORD following my remarks, along with a newspaper article commemorating this event and reflecting the recognition given by the State of South Carolina to this exceptional group of Clemson Tigers.

There being no objection, the material listing the player's number, name, and position was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MEMBERS OF THE 1981 NATIONAL CHAMPION CLEMSON UNIVERSITY TIGERS FOOTBALL TEAM

1.—Vandell Arrington, cornerback.
2.—Frank Magwood, wide receiver.
3.—Homer Jordan, quarterback.
5.—Dale Hatcher, punter.
6.—Bob Pauling, place kicker.
7.—Cliff Austin, tailback.

8.—Wilbur Bullard, tailback.
9.—Ken Brown, defensive back.
10.—Jeff Parker, quarterback.
11.—Mike Gasque, quarterback.
12.—Andy Headen, defensive back.
13.—Guy Varn, defensive back.
14.—Mike Eppley, quarterback
15.—Jeff Stockstill, wide receiver.
16.—Richard Hendley, punter.
17.—Anthony Parete, quarterback.
18.—Donald Igwebuike, placekicker.
19.—Richard Butler, wide receiver.
20.—Richard Donaldson, strong safety.
21.—Anthony Rose, cornerback.
22.—Perry Tuttle, wide receiver.
23.—Jeff Suttle, strong safety.
24.—Billy Davis, free safety.
25.—Randy Learn, free safety.
26.—Tim Childers, strong safety.
27.—Kevin Mack, fullback.
28.—Rod McSwain, cornerback.
29.—Hollis Hall, cornerback.
30.—Willie Ward, free safety.
31.—Carl Martin, strong safety.
32.—Jeff McCall, fullback.
33.—Kenny Danforth, defensive back.
34.—Braxton Williams, tailback.
35.—Chuck McSwain, tailback.
36.—Dean Day, linebacker.
37.—Fitzhugh Bethea, wide receiver.
38.—Brendon Crite, tailback.
39.—Jim Hohler, linebacker.
40.—Tim Basich, linebacker.
41.—Jerry Gaillard, wide receiver.
42.—Edgar Pickett, defensive end.
43.—Terry Kinard, free safety.
44.—Otis Lindsey, linebacker.
45.—Jeff Davis, linebacker.
46.—Duke Holloman, tailback.
47.—Roy Brown, linebacker.
48.—Craig Crawford, fullback.
49.—Ronald Watson, defensive back.
50.—Scott Williams, center.
51.—Jeff Lytton, center.
52.—Cary Massaro, center.
53.—Joe Glenn, defensive end.
54.—Jeff Cruce, offensive tackle.
55.—Randy Cheek, Linebacker.
56.—Chuckie Richardson, linebacker.
57.—Nick Bowman, defensive end.
58.—Dale Swing, center.
59.—Andy Cheatham, offensive guard.
60.—James Farr, offensive guard.
61.—Brad Fisher, offensive tackle.
62.—Brian Butcher, offensive guard.
63.—Tony Berryhill, center.
64.—Joe Ellis, offensive guard.
65.—Scott Weeks, center.
66.—William Perry, nose guard.
67.—Jim Scott, defensive tackle.
68.—Gary Brown, offensive tackle
69.—Vernie Anthony, nose guard.
70.—Brian Clark, offensive guard.
71.—Dan Benish, defensive tackle.
72.—Ray Brown, defensive tackle.
73.—Don Brinegar, offensive tackle.
74.—Bob Mayberry, offensive guard.
75.—Dean Herman, defensive tackle.
76.—Steve Berlin, defensive tackle.
77.—Lee Nanney, offensive tackle.
78.—Alex Hudson, offensive tackle.
80.—Jim Wurst, tight end.
81.—K. D. Dunn, tight end.
82.—Danny Triplett, linebacker.
84.—Bill Smith, defensive end.
85.—Bubba Diggs, tight end.
86.—Frank Fredere, tight end.
87.—Eldridge Milton, defensive end.
89.—Kendall Alley, wide receiver.
90.—Johnny Rembert, linebacker.
91.—Mike Wade, defensive end.
92.—Mark Richardson, defensive end.
94.—William Devane, nose guard.
95.—Kevin Gemas, linebacker.
96.—Chuck Meeks, linebacker.
97.—David Noelte, defensive end.
98.—Cliff McLellan, linebacker.
99.—Jeff Bryant, defensive tackle.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF

Danny Ford, head coach.
Willie Anderson, defensive line.
Steve Hale, defensive ends.
Curley Hallman, defensive backs.
Tom Harper, assistant head coach and defensive line.
Les Herrin, linebackers.
Lawson Holland, receivers.
Buddy King, offensive line.
Rex Kipps, tight ends.
Chuck Reedy, running backs.
Nelson Stokley, quarterbacks.
Larry Van Der Heyden, offensive line.
Rich Whitt, defensive backs.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT STAFF

H. C. (Bill) McLellan, athletic director.
Bobby Robinson, assistant athletic director.
Earle Ambrose, assistant to the athletic director.
Tim Bourret, associate sports information director.
Bob Bradley, sports information director.
Rick Brewer, assistant ticket manager.
Allison Dalton, promotion director.
Don Denning, administrative assistant.
George Dostal, strength training director.
Bobby Douglas, assistant equipment manager.
Len Gough, equipment manager.
Bert Henderson, assistant trainer.
Van Hilderbrand, ticket manager.
Fred Hoover, head trainer.
Les Jones, director of facilities.
Kim Kelly, assistant sports information director.
June Roach, football secretary.
Larry Sutton, assistant trainer.
Elaine Swearingen, football secretary.
Joe Turner, executive secretary of IPTAY.
Joe White, academic adviser.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY STUDENT ATHLETIC TRAINERS

Chip Winchester, Tony Blackwell, Robby Corley, Mark Abell, Bill Long, Danny Moss, Jay Bennett, Bob Easley, Joe Franks, Vann Yates, Greg Craig, Joel Bullard, and Mike Bowman.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY FOOTBALL MANAGERS

Ben Massengill, Alan Weitz, Eric Rivers, Jim Weldon, Jeff Singletary, Jimmy Seay, Jeff Wright, Mark Garrison, Lawrence Mudge, head manager, and Ricky Steen, head manager.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY CHEERLEADERS

Mark Barhyte, head cheerleader, Mary McNeil, Rick Conte, Pat Hook, David Pinion, Kathy Anderson, Scott Gallaway, Karen Lawing, George Helmrich, Jennifer Hemphill, Bill Brainger, Sheri Nix, Russell Ragen, Danny Pechthalt, and Ricky Capps, Tiger.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC COUNCIL, 1981-82

Kenneth N. Vickery, Chairman.
Dr. B. J. Skelton, Vice-Chairman.
Prof. H. W. Webb, Secretary.
Dr. J. F. Geldard.
Dr. Carolyn Briscoe.
Dr. B. J. Todd.
Dr. R. C. Harshman.
Dr. Stephen S. Melsheimer, President of the Faculty Senate.
Dr. C. Stassen Thompson, Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate.
Dr. Horace W. Fleming, Past President of the Faculty Senate.
Dr. Corinne Sawyer, Chairman of the Scholarship and Awards Committee.
I. L. "Rusty" Donkle, Jr., President of Alumni Association.
Billy G. Rogers, Immediate Past President of Alumni Association.
Dr. John H. Timmerman, President of IPTAY.
Charlie W. Bussey, Immediate Past President of IPTAY.
Fred J. Matthews, Chairman of the Graduate School Association.
John W. Pettigrew, Jr., President of the Student Body.
Reid W. Tribble, President of the Student Senate.
David Mannella, President of the Block "C" Club.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Thomas B. McTeer, Jr., Chairman (Columbia).
Louis P. Batson, Jr. (Greenville).
Robert R. Coker (Hartsville).
T. Kenneth Cribb (Spartanburg).
Dr. Fletcher C. Derrick, Jr. (Charleston).
William Green DesChamps, Jr. (Bishopville).
William N. Geiger, Jr. (Columbia).
Lewis F. Holmes, Jr. (Trenton).
Paul W. McAlister (Laurens).
Buck Mickel (Greenville).
James C. Self (Greenwood).
D. Leslie Tindal (Pinewood).
James M. Waddell, Jr. (Beaufort).

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Dr. Bill L. Atchley, President.
Dr. W. David Maxwell, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Melvin E. Barnette, Vice President for Business and Finance.
Walter T. Cox, Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students.
Admiral Joseph B. McDevitt, Executive Officer; Secretary to the Board of Trustees.
W. Harry Durham, Executive Director of University Relations.
Edward F. Byars, Executive Assistant to the President.
Benjamin W. Anderson, Legal Counsel.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY DEANS

Arnold E. Schwartz, Dean, Graduate Studies and University Research.
Luther P. Anderson, Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences.
Harlan E. McClure, Dean, College of Architecture.
Harold F. Landrith, Dean College of Education.
Benton H. Box, Dean, College of Forest and Recreation Resources.
Mary Lohr, Dean, College of Nursing.
Henry E. Vogel, Dean, College of Science.
Ryan C. Amacher, Dean, College of Industrial Management and Textile Science.
J. Charles Jennett, Dean, College of Engineering.
Robert A. Waller, Dean, College of Liberal Arts.

IPTAY OFFICERS

Dr. J. H. Timmerman, President & Director, District III.
Bill M. Reaves, Vice-President & Director, District IV.
Lawrence Starkey, Secretary-Treasurer & Director At-Large.
Jim Patterson, Director, District I.
C. Evans Putman, Director, District II.
J. Ryan White, Director, District V.
W. T. Fort, Jr., Director, District VI.
Eddie Dalton, Director, At-Large.
Garner Bagnal, Director, At-Large.
T. C. Atkinson, Jr., Director.
Charlie W. Bussey, Director.

W. G. DesChamps, Director.
Dr. R. C. Edwards, President Emeritus of Clemson University & Director.
Harper Gault, Director.
F. Reeves Gressette, Jr., Director.
Lewis F. Holmes, Director.
F. E. Hughes, Director.
Dr. G. J. Lawhon, Jr., Director.
Calhoun Lemon, Director.
George G. Poole, Jr., Director.
Chris Suber, Director.
W. H. Taylor, Director.
Marshall Walker, Director.

[From the Anderson Independent-Mail, Jan. 22, 1982]

LEGISLATORS AGREE: TIGERS ARE TOPS

COLUMBIA—Cheering, handclapping legislators and state officials gave a noisy salute Thursday to the national champion Clemson University football team.

A standing room only, overflow crowd created a pep rally atmosphere as Coach Danny Ford and the varsity squad entered the orange-decked House chamber.

"I am starting to get accustomed to this kind of thing," an obviously nervous Ford told the crowd.

"This football team overcame quite a bit of adversity, probaly more than you or anyone will ever know," he said. "I expect some of them to hold public office before they leave this earth."

Ford and Athletic Director Bill McLellan accepted Order of Palmetto citations from Gov. Dick Riley. The honor is the highest the governor can bestow.

Riley said he was issuing the citations "in appreciation and respect of your commitment to excellence."

The governor also declared Thursday through Jan. 28 "Clemson Tigers No. 1 Week" in South Carolina.

Ford, who introduced the players in a lengthy presentation he likened to a filibuster, joked that two team members got speeding tickets on their way to the State House for the ceremony.

"I hope you can help them out," he said. "If you can't get it marked off their record, maybe you can pay for it."

Ford said he is aware lawmakers have a lot of problems to deal with, including budget cutbacks.

"If you do like these guys (players) do, you will hitch up your belt and get down to serious work," he said. "That way, we can have the best football team and the best governing body."

Ford quipped that former South Carolina Coach Jim Carlen was standing where he was a year ago, as Heisman Trophy winner George Rogers was honored by the General Assembly.

"I don't mean anything by this, because Jim Carlen is a friend of mine. But I hope being here doesn't mean I won't be coaching at Clemson very long," he said to a laughing crowd.

Carlen was fired for undisclosed reasons in December.

Clemson is also holding "Fan Appreciation Day" on Saturday, with festivities beginning in Death Valley at 10 a.m. In the event of bad weather, the large gym in Fike Field House will serve as the meeting place.

The national championship trophy will be presented by United Press International, the Coach Of The Year Award will be given to Ford by the Washington Touchdown Club and the team will receive the Orange Bowl trophy, as well.

The entire Clemson team will be on hand, as will all of the coaching staff, for pictures and autographs. Fans are encouraged to come and meet some of their favorite players.

A short program has been planned at 11:30 a.m. with Ford kicking off the appreciation day ceremonies. The Clemson cheerleaders and members of the Central Spirit Committee will also have a part on the program.

Following ceremonies at the stadium, coach Annie Tribble's Lady Tiger basketball team will play Duke University's women at 12.30 p.m., and coach Bill Foster sends his Tigers against the Blue Devils at 3:30 p.m. in a regionally-televised game.

During halftime of the men's basketball game, three trophies will be presented to the football team members.

ANNUAL REPORT REQUIREMENT OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT

The following notice is submitted for the RECORD by the Secretary of the Senate:

The Office of Public Records, Office of the Secretary of the Senate, Room 623, 119 D Street, N.E. will be open Saturday, January 30, 1982 from 9 a.m. until 12 noon and Sunday, January 31st, 1982 from 12 noon until 3 p.m. to receive the January 31 Annual Report as required by the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended.

For further information or assistance contact the Office of Public Records (telephone number 224-0322).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 105

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying document, which was ordered to lie on the table.

To the Congress of the United States:

Today marks my first State of the Union address to you, a constitutional duty as old as our Republic itself.

President Washington began this tradition in 1790 after reminding the Nation that the destiny of self-government and the "preservation of the sacred fire of liberty" is "finally staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people." For our friends in the press, who place a high premium on accuracy, let me say: I did not actually hear George Washington say that, but it is a matter of historic record.

From this podium, Winston Churchill asked the free world to stand together against the onslaught of aggression. Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke of a day of infamy and summoned a nation to arms. Douglas MacArthur made an unforgettable farewell to a country he had loved and served so well. Dwight Eisenhower reminded us that peace was purchased only at the price of strength and John F. Kennedy spoke of the burden and glory that is freedom.

When I visited this Chamber last year as a newcomer to Washington, critical of past policies which I believe had failed, I proposed a new spirit of partnership between this Congress and this Administration and between Washington and our State and local governments.

In forging this new partnership for America we could achieve the oldest hopes of our Republic—prosperity for our Nation, peace for the world, and the blessings of individual liberty for our children and, someday, for all of humanity.

It is my duty to report to you tonight on the progress we have made in our relations with other nations, on the foundation we have carefully laid for our economic recovery and, finally, on a bold and spirited initiative that I believe can change the face of American government and make it again the servant of the people.

Seldom have the stakes been higher for America. What we do and say here will make all the difference to autoworkers in Detroit, lumberjacks in the Northwest, and steelworkers in Steubenville who are in the unemployment lines; to black teenagers in Newark and Chicago; to hard-pressed farmers and small businessmen; and to millions of everyday Americans who harbor the simple wish of a safe and financially secure future for their children.

To understand the state of the Union, we must look not only at where we are and where we are going but at where we have been. The situation at this time last year was truly ominous.

The last decade has seen a series of recessions. There was a recession in 1970, another in 1974, and again in the spring of 1980. Each time, unemployment increased and inflation soon turned up again. We coined the word "stagflation" to describe this.

Government's response to these recessions was to pump up the money supply and increase spending.

In the last 6 months of 1980, as an example, the money supply increased at the fastest rate in postwar history—13 percent. Inflation remained in double digits and Government spending increased at an annual rate of 17 percent. Interest rates reached a staggering 21½ percent. There were 8 million unemployed.

Late in 1981, we sank into the present recession—largely because continued high interest rates hurt the auto industry and construction. There was a drop in productivity and the already high unemployment rate increased.

This time, however, things are different. We have an economic program in place completely different from the artificial quick-fixes of the past. It calls for reduction of the rate of increase in Government spending, and already that rate has been cut nearly in half. But reduced spending alone isn't enough. We have just implemented the first and smallest phase of a 3-year tax-rate reduction plan designed to stimulate the economy and create jobs.

Already interest rates are down to 15¾ percent, but they must still go lower. Inflation is down from 12.4 percent to 8.9 percent, and for the month of December it was running at an annualized rate of 5.2 percent.

If we had not acted as we did, things would be far worse for all Americans than they are today. Inflation, taxes and interest rates would all be higher.

A year ago, Americans' faith in their governmental process was steadily declining. Six out of ten Americans were saying they were pessimistic about their future.

A new kind of defeatism was heard. Some said our domestic problems were uncontrollable—that we had to learn to live with the seemingly endless cycles of high inflation and high unemployment.

There were also pessimistic predictions about the relationship between our Administration and this Congress. It was said we could never work together. Well, those predictions were wrong.

The record is clear, and I believe history will remember this as an era of American renewal; remember this Administration as an administration of change; and remember this Congress as a Congress of destiny.

—Together, we not only cut the increase in Government spending nearly in half, we brought about the largest tax reductions and the most sweeping changes in our tax structure since the beginning of this century. And because we indexed future taxes to the rate of inflation, we took away Government's built-in profit on inflation and its hidden incentive to grow larger at the expense of the American workers.

—Together, after 50 years of taking power away from the hands of the people in their States and local communities, we have started returning power and resources to them.

—Together, we have cut the growth of new Federal regulations nearly in half. In 1981, there were 23,000 fewer pages in the Federal Register, which lists new regulations, than there were in 1980. By deregulating oil, we have come closer to achieving energy independence and helped bring down the costs of gasoline and heating fuel.

—Together, we have created an effective Federal strike force to combat waste and fraud in Government. In just 6 months it has saved the taxpayers more than $2 billion—and it's only getting started.

—Together, we have begun to mobilize the private sector—not to duplicate wasteful and discredited Government programs, but to bring thousands of Americans into a volunteer effort to help solve many of America's social problems.

—Together, we have begun to restore that margin of military safety that insures peace. Our country's uniform is being worn once again with pride.

Together, we have made a New Beginning, but we have only begun.

No one pretends that the way ahead will be easy. In my Inaugural Address last year, I warned that the "ills we suffer have come upon us over several decades. They will not go away in days, weeks or months, but they will go away . . . because we as Americans have the capacity now, as we've had in the past, to do whatever needs to be done to preserve this last and greatest bastion of freedom."

The economy will face difficult moments in the months ahead. But, the program for economic recovery that is in place will pull the economy out of its slump and put us on the road to prosperity and stable growth by the latter half of this year.

That is why I can report to you tonight that in the near future the state of the Union and the economy will be better—much better—if we summon the strength to continue on the course we have charted.

And so the question: If the fundamentals are in place, what now?

Two things. First, we must understand what is happening at the moment to the economy. Our current problems are not the product of the recovery program that is only just now getting under way, as some would have you believe; they are the inheritance of decades of tax and tax, spend and spend.

Second, because our economic problems are deeply rooted and will not respond to quick political fixes, we must stick to our carefully integrated plan for recovery. That plan is based on four common-sense fundamentals: continued reduction of the growth in Federal spending; preserving the individual and business tax reductions that will stimulate saving and investment; removing unnecessary Federal regulations to spark productivity; and maintaining a healthy dollar and a stable monetary policy—the latter a responsibility of the Federal Reserve System.

The only alternative being offered to this economic program is a return to the policies that gave us a trillion dollar debt, runaway inflation, runaway interest rates and unemployment.

The doubters would have us turn back the clock with tax increases that would offset the personal tax-rate reductions already passed by this Congress.

Raise present taxes to cut future deficits, they tell us. Well, I don't believe we should buy their argument. There are too many imponderables for anyone to predict deficits or surpluses several years ahead with any degree of accuracy. The budget in place when I took office had been projected as balanced. It turned out to have one of the biggest deficits in history. Another example of the imponderables that can make deficit projections highly questionable: A change of only one percentage point in unemployment can alter a deficit up or down by some $25 billion.

As it now stands, our forecasts, which we are required by law to make, will show major deficits, starting at less than $100 billion and declining, but still too high.

More important, we are making progress with the three keys to reducing deficits: economic growth, lower interest rates, and spending control. The policies we have in place will reduce the deficit steadily, surely and, in time, completely.

Higher taxes would not mean lower deficits. If they did, how would we explain that tax revenues more than doubled just since 1976, yet in the same 6-year period we ran the largest series of deficits in our history. In 1980 tax revenues increased by $54 billion—and in 1980 we had one of our all-time biggest deficits.

Raising taxes won't balance the budget. It will encourage more Government spending and less private investment. Raising taxes will slow economic growth, reduce production and destroy future jobs, making it more difficult for those without jobs to find them and more likely that those who now have jobs could lose them.

So I will not ask you to try to balance the budget on the backs of the American taxpayers. I will seek no tax increases this year and I have no intention of retreating from our basic program of tax relief. I promised the American people to bring their tax rates down and keep them down—to provide them incentives to rebuild our economy, to save, to invest in America's future. I will stand by my word. Tonight I am urging the American people: Seize these new opportunities to produce, save and invest, and together we will make this economy a mighty engine of freedom, hope and prosperity again.

The budget deficit this year will exceed our earlier expectations. The recession did that. It lowered revenues and increased costs. To some extent, we are also victims of our own success. We have brought inflation down faster than we thought we could and have thus deprived Government of those hidden revenues that occur when inflation pushes people into higher income tax brackets. And the continued high interest rates last year cost the Government about $5 billion more than anticipated.

We must cut our more non-essential Government spending and root out more waste, and we will continue our efforts to reduce the number of employees in the Federal work force by 75,000.

The budget plan I submit to you on February 8 will realize major savings by dismantling the Departments of Energy and Education, and by eliminating ineffective subsidies for business. We will continue to redirect our resources to our two highest budget priorities—a strong national defense to keep America free and at peace, and a reliable safety net of social programs for those who have contributed and those who are in need.

Contrary to some of the wild charges you may have heard, this Administration has not and will not turn its back on America's elderly or America's poor. Under the new budget, funding for social insurance programs will be more than double the amount spent only six years ago.

But it would be foolish to pretend that these or any programs cannot be made more efficient and economical.

The entitlement programs that make up our safety net for the truly needy have worthy goals and many deserving recipients. We will protect them. But there is only one way to see to it that these programs really help those whom they were designed to help, and that is to bring their spiraling costs under control.

Today we face the absurd situation of a Federal budget with three-quarters of its expenditures routinely referred to as "uncontrollable"—and a large part of this goes to entitlement programs.

Committee after committee of this Congress has heard witness after witness describe many of these programs as poorly administered and rife with waste and fraud. Virtually every American who shops in a local supermarket is aware of the daily abuses that take place in the food stamp program—which has grown by 16,000 percent in the last 15 years. Another example is medicare and medicaid—programs with worthy goals but whose costs have increased from $11.2 billion to almost $60 billion, more than five times as much, in just 10 years.

Waste and fraud are serious problems. Back in 1980, Federal investigators testified before one of your committees that "corruption has permeated virtually every area of the medicare and medicaid health care industry." One official said many of the people who are cheating the system were "very confident that nothing was going to happen to them."

Well, something is going to happen. Not only the taxpayers are defrauded—the people with real dependency on these programs are deprived of what they need because available resources are going not to the needy but to the greedy.

The time has come to control the uncontrollable.

In August we made a start. I signed a bill to reduce the growth of these programs by $44 billion over the next 3 years, while at the same time preserving essential services for the truly needy. Shortly you will receive from me a message on further reforms we intend to install—some new, but others long recommended by your own congressional committees. I ask you to help make these savings for the American taxpayer.

The savings we propose in entitlement programs will total some $63 billion over 4 years and will, without affecting social security, go a long way toward bringing Federal spending under control.

But don't be fooled by those who proclaim that spending cuts will deprive the elderly, the needy and the helpless. The Federal Government will still subsidize 95 million meals every day. That's one out of seven of all the meals served in America. Head Start, senior nutrition programs, and child welfare programs will not be cut from the levels we proposed last year. More than one-half billion dollars has been proposed for minority business assistance. And research at the National Institutes of Health will be increased by over $100 million. While meeting all these needs, we intend to plug unwarranted tax loopholes and strengthen the law which requires all large corporations to pay a minimum tax.

I am confident the economic program we have put into operation will protect the needy while it triggers a recovery that will benefit all Americans. It will stimulate the economy, result in increased savings and thus provide capital for expansion, mortgages for homebuilding, and jobs for the unemployed.

Now that the essentials of that program are in place, our next major undertaking must be a program—just as bold, just as innovative—to make government again accountable to the people, to make our system of federalism work again.

Our citizens feel they have lost control of even the most basic decisions made about the essential services of government, such as schools, welfare, roads, and even garbage collection. They are right.

A maze of interlocking jurisdictions and levels of government confronts average citizens in trying to solve even the simplest of problems. They do not know where to turn for answers, who to hold accountable, who to praise, who to blame, who to vote for or against.

The main reason for this is the overpowering growth of the Federal grants-in-aid programs during the past few decades.

In 1960, the Federal Government had 132 categorical grant programs, costing $7 billion. When I took office, there were approximately 500, costing nearly $100 billion—13 programs for energy conservation, 36 for pollution control, 66 for social services, and 90 for education. The list goes on and on. Here in the Congress, it takes at least 166 committees just to try to keep track of them.

You know and I know that neither the President nor the Congress can properly oversee this jungle of grants-in-aid; indeed, the growth of these grants has lead to a distortion in the vital functions of government. As one Democratic governor put it recently: The national Government should be worrying about "arms control not potholes."

The growth in these Federal programs has—in the words of one intergovernmental commission—made the Federal Government "more pervasive, more intrusive, more unmanageable, more ineffective, more costly and above all more unaccountable."

Let us solve this problem with a single, bold stroke—the return of some $47 billion in Federal programs To State and local government, together with the means to finance them and a transition period of nearly 10 years to avoid unnecessary disruption.

I will shortly send the Congress a message describing this program. I want to emphasize, however, that its full details will have been worked out only after close consultation with congressional, State and local officials.

Starting in fiscal 1984, the Federal Government will assume full responsibility for the cost of the rapidly growing medicaid program to go along with its existing responsibility for medicare. As part of a financially equal swap, the States will simultaneously take full responsibility for aid to families with dependent children and food stamps. This will make welfare less costly and more responsive to genuine need because it will be designed and administered closer to the grassroots and the people it serves.

In 1984, the Federal Government will apply the full proceeds from certain excise taxes to a grassroots trust fund that will belong, in fair shares, to the 50 States. The total amount flowing into this fund will be $28 billion a year.

Over the next 4 years, the States can use this money in either of two ways. If they want to continue receiving Federal grants in such areas as transportation, education and social services, they can use their trust fund money to pay for the grants or—to the extent they choose to forego the Federal grant programs—they can use their trust fund money on their own, for those or other purposes. There will be a mandatory pass-through of part of these funds to local governments.

By 1988, the States will be in complete control of over 40 Federal grant programs. The trust fund will start to phase out, eventually to disappear, and the excise taxes will be turned over to the States. They can then preserve, lower or raise taxes on their own and fund and manage these programs as they see fit.

In a single stroke, we will be accomplishing a realignment that will end cumbersome administration and spiraling costs at the Federal level while we insure these programs will be more responsive to both the people they are meant to help and the people who pay for them.

Hand in hand with this program to strengthen the discretion and flexibility of State and local governments, we are proposing legislation for an experimental effort to improve and develop our depressed urban areas in the 1980's and 1990's. This legislation will permit States and localities to apply to the Federal Government for designation as urban enterprise zones. A broad range of special economic incentives in the zones will help attract new business, new jobs, and new opportunity to America's inner cities and rural towns. Some will say our mission is to save free enterprise. I say we must free enterprise so that, together, we can save America.

Some will also say our States and local communities are not up to the challenge of a new and creative partnership. That might have been true 20 years ago before reforms like reapportionment and the Voting Rights Act, the 10-year extension of which I strongly support. It is no longer true today. This Administration has faith in State and local governments and the constitutional balance envisioned by the Founding Fathers. We also believe in the integrity, decency and sound good sense of grassroots Americans.

Our faith in the American people is reflected in another major endeavor. Our private sector initiatives task force is seeking out successful community models of school, church, business, union, foundation and civic programs that help community needs. Such groups are almost invariably far more efficient than government in running social programs.

We are not asking them to replace discarded and often discredited government programs dollar for dollar, service for service. We just want to help them perform the good works they choose, and help others to profit by their example. Three hundred eighty-five thousand corporations and private organizations are already working on social programs ranging from drug rehabilitation to job training, and thousands more Americans have written us asking how they can help. The volunteer spirit is still alive and well in America.

Our Nation's long journey towards civil rights for all our citizens—once a source of discord, now a source of pride—must continue with no backsliding or slowing down. We must and shall see that those basic laws that guarantee equal rights are preserved and, when necessary, strengthened.

Our concern for equal rights for women is firm and unshakable. We launched a new Task Force on Legal Equity for Women, and a Fifty-States Project that will examine State laws for discriminatory language. And for the first time in our history a woman sits on the highest court in the land. So, too, the problem of crime—one as real and deadly serious as any in America today—demands that we seek transformation of our legal system, which overly protects the rights of criminals while it leaves society and the innocent victims of crime without justice.

We look forward to the enactment of a responsible Clean Air Act to increase jobs while continuing to improve the quality of our air. We are encouraged by the bipartisan initiative of the House and are hopeful of further progress as the Senate continues its deliberations.

So far I have concentrated largely on domestic matters. To view the state of the Union in perspective, we must not ignore the rest of the world. There isn't time tonight for a lengthy treatment of foreign policy—a subject I intend to address in detail in the near future. A few words, however, are in order on the progress we have made over the past year reestablishing respect for our Nation around the globe and some of the challenges and goals we will approach in the year ahead.

At Ottawa and Cancun, I met with leaders of the major industrial powers and developing nations. Some of those I met were a little surprised that I didn't apologize for America's wealth. Instead I spoke of the strength of the free marketplace system and how it could help them realize their aspirations for economic development and political freedom. I believe lasting friendships were made and the foundation was laid for future cooperation.

In the vital region of the Caribbean basin, we are developing a program of aid, trade and investment incentives to promote self-sustaining growth and a better, more secure life for our neighbors to the South. Toward those who would export terrorism and subversion in the Caribbean and elsewhere, especially Cuba and Libya, we will act with firmness.

Our foreign policy is a policy of strength, fairness and balance. By restoring America's military credibility, by pursuing peace at the negotiating table wherever both sides are willing to sit down in good faith, and by regaining the respect of America's allies and adversaries alike, we have strengthened our country's position as a force for peace and progress in the world.

When action is called for, we are taking it. Our sanctions against the military dictatorship that has attempted to crush human rights in Poland—and against the Soviet regime behind that military dictatorship—clearly demonstrated to the world that America will not conduct "business as usual" with the forces of oppression.

If the events in Poland continue to deteriorate, further measures will follow.

Let me also note that private American groups have taken the lead in making January 30 a day of solidarity with the people of Poland—so, too, the European Parliament has called for March 21 to be an international day of support for Afghanistan. I urge all peace-loving peoples to join together on those days, to raise their voices, to speak and pray for freedom.

Meanwhile, we are working for reduction of arms and military activities. As I announced in my address to the Nation last November 18, we have proposed to the Soviet Union a far-reaching agenda for mutual reduction of military forces and have already initiated negotiations with them in Geneva on intermediate-range nuclear forces.

In those talks it is essential that we negotiate from a position of strength. There must be a real incentive for the Soviets to take these talks seriously. This requires that we rebuild our defenses.

In the last decade, while we sought the moderation of Soviet power through a process of restraint and accommodation, the Soviets engaged in an unrelenting build-up of their military forces.

The protection of our national security has required that we undertake a substantial program to enhance our military forces.

We have not neglected to strengthen our traditional alliances in Europe and Asia, or to develop key relationships with our partners in the Middle East and other countries.

Building a more peaceful world requires a sound strategy and the national resolve to back it up. When radical forces threaten our friends, when economic misfortune creates conditions of instability, when strategically vital parts of the world fall under the shadow of Soviet power, our response can make the difference between peaceful change or disorder and violence. That is why we have laid such stress not only on our own defense, but on our vital foreign assistance program. Your recent passage of the Foreign Assistance Act sent a signal to the world that America would not shrink from making the investments necessary for both peace and security. Our foreign policy must be rooted in realism, not naivete or self-delusion.

A recognition of what the Soviet empire is about is the starting point. Winston Churchill, in negotiating with the Soviets, observed that they respect only strength and resolve in their dealings with other nations.

That is why we have moved to reconstruct our national defenses. We intend to keep the peace—we will also keep our freedom.

We have made pledges of a new frankness in our public statements and worldwide broadcasts. In the face of a climate of falsehood and misinformation, we have promised the world a season of truth—the truth of our great civilized ideas: individual liberty, representative government, the rule of law under God.

We have never needed walls, mine fields and barbwire to keep our people in. Nor do we declare martial law to prevent our people from voting for the kind of government they want.

Yes, we have our problems; yes, we are in a time of recession. And it's true, there is no quick fix to instantly end the tragic pain of unemployment. But we *will* end it—the process has already begun and we'll see its effect as this year goes on.

We speak with pride and admiration of that little band of Americans who overcame insuperable odds to set this Nation on course 200 years ago. But our glory didn't end with them—Americans ever since have emulated their deeds.

We don't have to turn to our history books for heroes. They are all around us. One who sits among you here tonight epitomized that heroism at the end of the longest imprisonment ever inflicted on men of our armed forces. Who can ever forget that night when we waited for television to bring us the scene of that first plane landing at Clark Field in the Philippines—bringing our POWs home. The plane door opened and Jeremiah Denton came slowly down the ramp. He caught sight of our flag, saluted, and said, "God bless America," then thanked us for bringing him home.

Just two weeks ago, in the midst of a terrible tragedy on the Potomac, we saw again the spirit of American heroism at its finest—the heroism of dedicated rescue workers saving crash victims from icy waters. We saw the heroism of one of our young Government employees, Lenny Skutnik, who, when he saw a woman lose her grip on the helicopter line, dived into the water and dragged her to safety.

And then there are countless quiet, everyday heroes of American life—parents who sacrifice long and hard so their children will know a better life than they have known; church and civic volunteers who help to feed, clothe, nurse and teach the needy; millions who have made our Nation, and our Nation's destiny, so very special—unsung heroes who may not have realized their dreams themselves but who then reinvest those dreams in their children.

Don't let anyone tell you that America's best days are behind her—that the American spirit has been vanquished. We've seen it triumph too often in our lives to stop believing in it now.

One hundred and twenty years ago, the greatest of all our Presidents delivered his second State of the Union Message in this Chamber. "We cannot escape history," Abraham Lincoln warned. "We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves." The "trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

That President and that Congress did not fail the American people. Together, they weathered the storm and preserved the Union.

Let it be said of us that we, too, did not fail; that we, too, worked together to bring America through difficult times. Let us so conduct ourselves that two centuries from now, another Congress and another President, meeting in this Chamber as we are meeting, will speak of us with pride, saying that we met the test and preserved for them in their day the sacred flame of liberty—this last, best hope of man on Earth.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1982.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 382. Joint resolution to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland."

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has appointed the following Members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1982: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina, ex officio.

The message further announced that pursuant to Public Law 453 of the 96th Congress, as amended, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has appointed the following Members on the part of the House to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1982: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina, ex officio.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-2474. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation adopted by the Council on December 8, 1981; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2475. A communication from the Director of the Office of Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Agency on the disposal of foreign excess property for fiscal year 1981; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2476. A communication from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new Privacy Act system of records for the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2477. A communication from the Secretary of the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the revision of a Privacy Act system of records by the Commission; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2478. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Administration), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new Privacy Act system of records for the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2479. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of the judgment funds awarded to the Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Indians of Idaho; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2480. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of the judgment funds awarded to the Colorado River Indian Tribes of the Colorado River Indian Reservation; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2481. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of judgment funds awarded to the Kalispel Indian Community of Washington; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2482. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the use of the judgment funds awarded to the Spokane Indian Tribe of the Spokane Reservation; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2483. A communication from the Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on battered women and the administration of justice and a report on the Federal response to domestic violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2484. A communication from the Veterans of World War I, transmitting an accountant's audit of the organization for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2485. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the impact of CETA on employability development systems; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2486. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on public health personnel in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2487. A communication from the Director of ACTION, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice on VISTA guidelines; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2488. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal voting assistance program, December 1981; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-2489. A communication from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the sharing of medical resources program of the Veterans' Administration for fiscal year 1981; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2490. A communication from the Executive Associate Director of the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of reapportionment of appropriations for salaries and expenses of U.S. attorneys and marshals of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2491. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2492. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of four construction projects to be undertaken by the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2493. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Marine Fisheries Service report for the calendar year 1979; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2494. A communication from the Secretary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a request for additional time to investigate tariff schedules; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2495. A communication from the Director of the Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "An Assessment of Development and Production Potential of Federal Coal Leases"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2496. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Strategic Petroleum Reserve: Substantial Progress Made, but Capacity and Oil Quality Concerns Remain"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2497. A communication from the Under Secretary of Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the oil and gas lease sale No. 67, Gulf of Mexico, to be held February 9, 1982; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2498. A communication from the Chairman of the Upper Mississippi River Basin Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the comprehensive master plan for management of the upper Mississippi River system; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2499. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1980 on the administration of the ocean dumping permit program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2500. A communication from the Chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contract activity involving fiscal year 1978 funds and changes in obligations thereof in fiscal year 1981; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2501. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Legislative and Administrative Changes To Improve Verification of Welfare Recipients' Income and Assets Could Save Hundreds of Millions"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2502. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Tax-Exempt Financing of Railroad Feeder Line Rehabilitation"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2503. A communication from the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission transmitting a statement of the Commission regarding the decision to permit the Internal Revenue Service to grant tax-exempt status to schools that discriminate on the basis of race; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2504. A communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on his efforts to prevent the spraying of marihuana with herbicides that are likely to cause serious harm to human health; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2505. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a new personnel record system; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2506. A communication from the Director of the Office of Congressional and Public Affairs of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report for 1980 on the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2507. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a plan for the use and distribution of funds awarded to the Shawnee Tribe of Indians; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2508. A communication from the Director of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Judicial Conference of the United States on the Federal magistrates system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2509. A communication from the Secretary of the Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the final regulations for the institutional aid program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2510. A communication from the Secretary of the Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1982-83 Pell grant program family contribution schedule; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2511. A communication from the Secretary of the Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the final regulations of the educational opportunity centers program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2512. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a study of State laws, death investigation systems, practices, and their impact on those affected by sudden infant death syndrome; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2513. A communication from the Chairman of the President's Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research, transmitting, pursuant to law, a biennial report on "Protecting Human Subjects"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2514. A communication from the Acting Executive Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for fiscal year 1981; to the Committee on Small Business.

EC-2515. A communication from the Acting General Counsel of the U.S. General Accounting Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the status of budget authority proposed for rescission, but for which Congress failed to pass a rescission bill; to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Budget, and the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2516. A communication from the General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of legislation concerning costs and fees incurred by civilians employed by the Armed Forces appearing before foreign judicial tribunals; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2517. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports for each of the armed services concerning compliance with the Aviation Career Incentive Act during the period October 1, 1980, through September 30, 1981; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2518. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the allocation of civilians in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2519. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research, Development and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the conversion of performance of commercial and industrial type functions from DOD personnel to private contractors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2520. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Facilities, Environment, and Economic Adjustment, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 11 construction projects to be undertaken by the Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2521. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Facilities, Environment, and Economic Adjustment, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 19 construction projects to be undertaken by the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2522. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the enforcement of title I of the Consumer Credit Protection Act for the calendar year 1981; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2523. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on Indian and Alaska Native housing and community development programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2524. A communication from the Under Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the uranium mill tailings remedial action program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2525. A communication from the Secretary of Argiculture and the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of delay in preparation of the biomass energy production and use plan for the 1983-90 period; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2526. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on power pooling in the electric utility industry; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2527. A communication from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a refund of excess royalty payments to Gulf Oil Corp.; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2528. A communication from the Federal inspector of the Alaska natural gas transportation system, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on project developments from October 1981 through December 1981; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2529. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report (Fiscal Year 1980) on Federal Government Energy Management; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2530. A communication from the Commissioner of the Northern Mariana Islands Commission on Federal Laws, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the application of U.S. law on the islands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2531. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on 13 lease prospectuses; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2532. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Do Aged Medicare Patients Receive More Costly Routine Nursing Services? Evidence Inconclusive"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2533. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services transmitting, pursuant to law, the 14th Annual Report on Medicare for Fiscal Year 1980; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2534. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the Treasury combined statement of receipts, expenditures and balances of the U.S. Government for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1981; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2535. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Legislation Authorized Benefits Without Adequate Evidence of Black Lung or Disability"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2536. A communication from the Acting Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of international agreements other than treaties, entered into by the United States within the previous 60 days; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2537. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a review of selected Presidential and Vice Presidential expenditures for fiscal 1980; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2538. A communication from the Inspector General of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the Office of Inspector General for the period July 1 to September 30, 1981; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2539. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Health of the Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Drug Abuse Treatment Outcome Prospective Study (TOPS)"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2540. A communication from the Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a Report on the Donation of Federal Surplus Personal Property for Fiscal Year 1981; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2541. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Redistricting Procedure Act of 1981"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2542. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Unemployment Trust Fund Revenue Temporary Act of 1981"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2543. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Uniform Commercial Code Amendments Act of 1981"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2544. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Election, Campaign Finance Reform and Conflict of Interest Act, Latino Community Development, and Official Correspondence Regulations Amendments Act of 1981"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2545. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a recommendation for the use and distribution of funds awarded to the Wyandot Indians; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2546. A communication from the Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a conference report on the Freedom of Information Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2547. A communication from the acting circuit executive of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Judicial Circuit, transmitting a summary and annual report for the year 1981; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2548. A communication from the Clerk of the U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the court for the year ended September 30, 1981; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2549. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on final regulations for school assistance in case of certain disasters; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2550. A communication from the Deputy Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a note on responses to National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity reports; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2551. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial disclosure report regarding Public Health Service; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2552. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmiting, pursuant to law, the Fiscal Year 1980 Report on the Health Maintenance Organization Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2553. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fiscal Year 1981 Report of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Advisory Council; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2554. A communication from the Chairman for the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on public financing of candidates for the 1980 Presidential primary and general elections; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2555. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fiscal Year 1981 Report on the Government Printing Office's Financial Statements; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-2556. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a trade regulation and statement of basis and purpose governing the sale of used motor vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-656. A resolution adopted by the Texas Section, Society for Range Management, opposing proposed changes in the Draft 1981 Resources Conservation Act Program Report; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

POM-657. A petition from a citizen of Fort Valley, Georgia, favoring the building of certain weapons systems necessary to America's security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM-658. A petition from a citizen of St. Augustine, Florida, favoring congressional cooperation with the efforts of the Reagan Administration to strengthen America's military power; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM-659. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

"HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 296"

"Whereas, There is now pending before the Congress S. 1406, which would preempt the Michigan usury law; and

"Whereas, Michigan, along with most other states, has continually evaluated its interest rate ceilings, along with its other consumer protection laws, and has seen fit to raise those limits on various types of loans over the past years to meet the unique economic needs of the state; and

"Whereas, The states have historically regulated interest rates, other charges, and contract terms on loans to consumers to prevent gouging and other abuses; and

"Whereas, S. 1406 goes far beyond the removal of interest rate ceilings and will eliminate any law or constitutional provision which in any way limits what may be charged in consumer credit transactions; and

"Whereas, S. 1406 threatens to undermine language in Michigan law which requires that fees in addition to interest be 'reasonable and necessary' or be related to 'actual expenses', and would eliminate the prohibition now contained in Michigan law against variable interest rates, without providing adequate protection to consumers; and

"Whereas, The Michigan Legislature has, as recently as July of this year, enacted a law to curb abuses in the second mortgage industry. The attorney general has moved vigorously to enforce existing laws which prohibit excessive interest rates and high brokerage fees on second mortgages, and the passage of S. 1406 will eliminate vital provisions of those laws allowing the homes of Michigan citizens to be put at risk; and

"Whereas, The people of Michigan are already staggering under the burden of high prices for food, shelter, transportation, medical care, utilities, reduced real incomes, and underemployment or unemployment; and

"Whereas, The real incomes of American families were down 5.5 percent in 1980, the biggest plunge since the Census Bureau began keeping statistics in 1947, and 492,000 workers in Michigan were unemployed in August, fully 11 percent of the labor force; and

"Whereas, Michigan consumers and businesses are already overburdened with high interest rates to the point where the costs of financing have made the purchase of homes and cars undesirable if not impossible for Michigan citizens, and have contributed to the decline of Michigan businesses; and

"Whereas, The University of Michigan's prestigious Survey Research Center has reported that:

'Favorable buying attitudes have remained near record low levels due to high interest rates—especially in the housing and car markets.'; and

"Whereas, Removing interest rate ceilings on mortgages and business loans through the federal Monetary Control Act of 1980 has not revitalized mortgage lending or small business; and

"Whereas, Two of the most successful stimulants to the Michigan economy in the last year were the lowering of interest to 13.8 percent on auto loans by GMAC and to 12⅞ percent on home loans through the investment of state pension funds; and

"Whereas, Elimination of interest rate ceilings in individual states without regard for the integral role they play in consumer protection schemes has led to higher interest rates and abuses; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by The House of Representatives*, That this body urges the United States Congress to reject S. 1406 and any other similar legislation that would preempt the duly considered laws regulating consumer credit which have been enacted by this Legislature or that of any other state; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each member of the Michigan delegation in the United States Congress, to the Chairperson of the Committee on Banking in the United States Senate, and to the Chairperson of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking Finance and Urban Affairs."

POM-660. A resolution adopted by the Nevada Cattlemen's Association and Nevada Woolgrowers Association Joint Convention, favoring the purchasing of Federal Reserve stock and setting up a new monetary system; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

POM-661. A resolution adopted by the Council of State Governments' Eastern Regional Conference, opposing Federal preemption of State usury laws; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

POM-662. A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen, St. Louis, Missouri, relative to transportation of radioactive materials; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM-663. A resolution adopted by the Nevada Cattlemen's Association and Nevada Woolgrowers Association, relative to the MX Missile on rangeland; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-664. A resolution adopted by the Baton Rouge Area Chamber of Commerce, relative to access to natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-665. A resolution adopted by Council 92, AFSCME, Maryland Employees, opposing the decontrol of natural gas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-666. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

"AMENDED HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 33

"*Be it Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio:*

"Whereas, The Congress of the United States is currently conducting a legislative review of the Clear Air Act, and is considering amendments to that statute; and

"Whereas, As a part of this process, Congress will be determining whether legislative action imposing new, more restictive air pollution control requirements is necessary to remedy harms alleged to result from the long range transport of air pollutants, such as 'acid rain'; and

"Whereas, The President is currently evaluating the request of the Government of Canada for the negotiation of an international agreement on the subject of transboundary air pollution and 'acid rain,' which agreements may require the imposition of unduly restrictive air pollution control requirements; and

"Whereas, There is substantial disagreement among members of the scientific community concerning the mechanics of the long range transport of air pollutants, and the origins, effects, and control of 'acid rain'; and

"Whereas, The imposition of unduly restrictive air pollution control requirements, especially those relating to the control of emissions of sulfur dioxide, will have a severe detrimental impact on Ohio industry, its employees, utility ratepayers, and on all citizens of Ohio; now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the 114th General Assembly of the State of Ohio memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to consider the impact on the economy and energy requirements of Ohio and other midwestern states which may result from proposed amendments to the Clean Air Act, or from the proposed transboundary air pollution agreement with Canada; to recognize that there is insufficient scientific agreement on the mechanics of the long range transport of air pollutants and the origins, impacts and control of 'acid rain;' and to accelerate scientific study of these problems before imposing regulatory requirements which may be unnecessary and severely harmful; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the presiding officer of each House of Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Ohio in the Congress of the United States."

POM—667. A resolution adopted by the Nevada Cattlemen's Association and the Nevada Woolgrowers Association Joint Convention, relative to abolishing the Federal estate and gift tax; to the Committee on Finance.

POM—668. A resolution adopted by the Nevada Cattlemen's Association and the Nevada Woolgrowers Association Joint Convention, relative to the exemption for the Federal estate and gift tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

POM—669. A resolution adopted by the Nevada Cattlemen's Association and the Nevada Woolgrowers Association Joint Convention, relative to the Federal estate and gift tax laws; to the Committee on Finance.

POM—670. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"SENATE MEMORIAL NO. 1 MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO CONDEMN TYRANNY AGAINST THE POLISH PEOPLE AND TO SUPPORT SOLIDARITY

"Whereas, For the past eighteen months, Polish workers, organized under the banner of the labor movement Solidarity have struggled to democratize the oppressive political and economic system imposed on their land; and

"Whereas, The courage of the Polish people in patiently struggling for basic economic and political freedoms in the face of threats of government oppression at home and military invasion from abroad has stirred the sympathies of workers and lovers of freedom throughout the world; and

"Whereas, On December 12, the Polish government declared martial law and the Polish army moved against the Polish people to smother the spark of freedom; and

"Whereas, Thousands of Polish labor leaders and intellectuals, leaders of the rebirth of freedom in Poland, have been imprisoned and held incommunicado since the declaration of martial law; and

"Whereas, The Polish government has repudiated its agreements with the Polish workers, nullified the hard-won bargains of the past two years, and imposed a reign of tyranny on its own people; now therefore,

"*Be It Resolved by the Senate of the Fifty-third General Assembly of the State of Colorado:* That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to condemn the imposition by the Polish government of martial law and the crushing of human rights by the Polish army, and to lend all moral and other support to Solidarity and the Polish people.

"*Be it further resolved*, That the Congress urge the President to bring all necessary and appropriate pressure to bear on the governments of Poland and the Soviet Union for their direct and indirect suppression of liberty in Poland.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each member of Congress from the State of Colorado."

POM-671. A petition from a citizen of Elkton, Maryland, opposing support to the South West Africa People's Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-672. A petition from a citizen of Camden, South Carolina, opposing support to the South West Africa People's Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-673. A resolution adopted by a Town Meeting of Needham, Massachusetts, favoring a mutual nuclear arms moratorium with the Soviet Union and the transfer of the funds to civilian use; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-674. A resolution adopted by the North Altantic Assembly, relative to helping Portugal over its economic problems; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-675. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 451

"Whereas, Mobil Corporation's proposed offer to purchase the stock of Marathon Oil Company has once again raised serious questions regarding such multi-billion dollar corporate mergers. Indeed, such a takeover by the Nation's second largest oil conglomerate would undoubtedly have a tremendous impact on the petroleum industry; and

"Whereas, Marathon Oil Company, which currently operates a highly productive refinery in Detroit and owns some 315 active oil and gas wells and an extensive pipeline network throughout the State, is one of Michigan's most important business interests. In addition to employing approximately 1,700 people in Michigan, Marathon operates well over 500 retail outlets statewide and sells various petroleum products to a host of independent marketers as well as agricultural, commercial, and residential accounts; and

"Whereas, the potential purchase of Marathon by Mobil Corporation would have a devastating effect on Michigan's petroleum marketplace. Not only would such a merger instantaneously establish Mobil as the State's largest gasoline retailer, it would also render uncertain the future of Marathon's many retail outlets. Moreover, Mobil's past activities in our State and its policy of not selling to private brand dealers offer little reassurance to the many independent retailers who presently depend on Marathon for their products. Indeed, the continuing operation of Marathon's Detroit refinery could also be endangered, resulting in the loss of many jobs; and

"Whereas, both the private and public sectors of Michigan's already recession-crippled economy may suffer immeasurable harm from a merger of Mobil Corporation and Marathon Oil Company; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That the Michigan Legislature hereby memoralize the United States Congress to enact H.R. 4930, establishing a moratorium on Mobil Corporation's proposed purchase of Marathon Oil Company; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Michigan Congressional Delegation."

POM-676. A petition from a citizen of Cranford, New Jersey, relative to the "Gay Bill of Rights"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-677. A resolution adopted by the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church Center, relative to the treatment of Haitians on United States soil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-678. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States to Pass Legislation to Rehire the Air Traffic Controllers

"Whereas, the President's firing of the eleven thousand five hundred air traffic controllers has caused undue hardship on the public and the families of the air traffic controllers; and

"Whereas, the professional air traffic controllers organization as well as all public employees have been taught the lessons that President Ronald Reagan wanted to get across to them: that public employees have no right to strike and no right in the political process of deciding how public funds are to be spent; and

"Whereas, the offending union has been destroyed through decertification; and

"Whereas, the trainees hired to replace the fired controllers are not working out and it is now clear that the air traffic flight system will be disrupted for years; and

"Whereas, it is a colossal waste of money to spend one and three tenths billion dollars in training these replacements; Now therefore be it

"*Resolved,* that the Federal Congress develop a reliable fact-finding and mediation process which is the major cause for the PATCO strike; and be it further

"*Resolved,* that the Massachusetts Senate go on record respectfully requesting the President to rehire the former strikers as the fair and equitable thing to do; and be further

"*Resolved,* that copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the clerk of the Senate to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to those Members of the Congress from Massachusetts."

POM-679. A petition from a citizen of Oviedo, Florida, relative to union violence in America; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

POM-680. A resolution adopted by the Manchester Township Committee, relative to resettlement of Cuban and Haitian refugees at Lakehurst Naval Station; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

POM-681. A resolution adopted by the California Library Service Board, favoring continued funding for the Library Construction and Services Act; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

POM—682. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

"A Concurrent Resolution Urging the President, the Congress and the Governor to Give Their Full Support to Our Vietnam War Veterans

"Whereas, several million young Americans were conscripted to serve in the Vietnam War from 1964 to 1973; and

"Whereas, more than 50,000 Americans were killed and more than 150,000 other Americans were wounded during that war; and

"Whereas, on their return to the United States the Vietnam veterans were not accorded the welcome, the celebration, the thanks that was accorded the return of the American veterans of other wars or the American victims of other oppressions; and

"Whereas, the debt of America to these brave men and women, who sacrificed in response to our commands, has not been properly acknowledged and our gratitude to them has not been adequately expressed:

"Therefore, be it *resolved,* by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the House of Representatives concurring:

"Section 1. That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriately convey the thanks of a grateful nation to every American veteran of the Vietnam War.

"Section 2. That we declare May 1, 1982, to be Vietnam Veterans Day and request the Governor to issue a proclamation to that effect.

"Section 3. That on behalf of the people of the State of Indiana, we proclaim our pride in the American veterans of the Vietnam War; we appreciate their gallant efforts and their great sacrifices. We thank them.

"Section 4. That we hereby pledge to do all in our power to make the opportunities of the Vietnam veteran equal to those of every other American and solicit the help of the Governor in this regard.

"Section 5. That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the leadership of both houses of the Congress, the Indiana delegation to both houses of Congress and to the Governer of the State of Indiana."

POM-683. A petition from a citizen of Shingleton, Michigan, relative to the treatment of the unemployed, disabled, and elderly; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 289. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration (Rept. No. 97-308); placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 290. An original resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the "Senate Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 97-309); placed on the calendar.

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 295. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations (Rept. No. 97-310); referred to the Committee on rules and administration.

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the budget, without amendment:

S. Res. 258. An original resolution waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 witht respect to the consideration of S. 1662; placed on the calendar.

S. Res. 259. An original resolution waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of S. 1906; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. Res. 286. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 287. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. Res. 288. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DOLE, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. Res. 291. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. Res. 292. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Appropriations; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Res. 293. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WEICKER, from the Committee on Small Business, without amendment:

S. Res. 294. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. Res. 296. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Affairs; referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S.J. Res. 139. An original joint resolution to provide for the release within the United States of the U.S. International Communication Agency production: A Day of Solidarity; placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TOWER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the following nominations: in the Air Force Reserve there are 140 promotions to the grade of colonel (list begins with Earl A. Aler, Jr.), in the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard there are 12 promotions to the grade of lieutenant colonel (list begins with Charles M. Dooley), in the Regular Air Force and Air Force Reserve there are 140 appointments to the grade of colonel and below (list begins with James F. Boyle), in the Navy and Naval Reserve there are 24 permanent promotions to the grade of captain and below (list begins with Robert A. Sulit), in the Navy and Naval Reserve there are 136 permanent appointments to the grade of captain and below (list begins with Thomas H. Barge II), in the Navy there are 150 permanent promotions to the grade of lieutenant commander (list begins with John W. Ackerman), and in the Navy and Naval Reserve there are 22 permanent promotions to the grade of captain and below (list begins with William H. Hamilton, Jr.). Since these names have already appeared in the Congressional Record and to save the expense of printing again, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The nominations ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk appear in the Record of December 15 and December 16, 1981, at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. Thurmond and Mr. Jackson):

S. 2018. A bill to authorize the presentation on behalf of the Congress of a specially struck gold medal to Adm. Hyman George Rickover; read the first time.

By Mr. BUMPERS (for himself, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Robert C. Byrd, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Heflin, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Levin, Mr. Sasser, Mr. Exon, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Long, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pell, Mr. Metzenbaum, Mr. Pryor, Mr. DeConcini, Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Chiles, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Ford):

S. 2019. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of the Veterans' Affairs to pay certain burial and funeral expenses of certain veterans and to provide a cemetery plot allowance for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KASTEN (for himself, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Symms, Mr. Helms, Mr. Hayakawa, and Mrs. Hawkins):

S. 2020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the individual income tax rate reductions enacted by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 for 1962 and subsequent years shall take effect 6 months sooner than scheduled under the act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAKER (for Mr. Domenici):

S. 2021. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal lands in New Mexico and for the acquisition of certain other lands in Bernalillo County, N. Mex., to be purchased with the proceeds from the disposal of such Federal lands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Pell, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Biden, Mr. Chafee, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Long, Mr. Riegle, and Mr. Sarbanes):

S. 2022. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 2023. A bill to assist in the admission into the United States of certain aliens who have fled from Poland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLE (by request):

S. 2024. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prohibit the granting of tax-exempt status to organizations maintaining schools with racially discriminatory policies; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURENBERGER (for himself and Mr. Andrews):

S. 2025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for investment in district heating and cooling systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURENBERGER:

S. 2026. A bill for the relief of Van Nghiep Tran, Quang Nguyen Tran, and Van Tin Nguyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD:

S. 2027. A bill to provide for an accelerated study of the causes and effects of acid precipitation, to provide for an examination of certain acid precursor control technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. Bumpers, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Matsunaga):

S. 2028. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore eligibility for unemployment compensation for certain ex-servicemembers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 2029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prohibit the granting of tax-exempt status to private schools with racially discriminatory policies and to require the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain a judical finding of racial discrimination before terminating or denying tax-exempt status to private schools on the grounds of racial discrimination; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM:

S. 2030. A bill for the relief of Shiu Kow Ming, M.D., and Wai May Ming, husband and wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 2031. A bill to provide for a 3-year suspension of the duty on copper scale; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SASSER (for himself and Mr. Baker):

S. 2032. A bill to amend section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, to provide that amounts available as a result of a withdrawal of approval of a portion of the Interstate Highway System may be used to provide operating assistance for mass transportation systems; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PERCY:

S.J. Res. 139. An original joint resolution to provide for the release within the United States of the U.S. International Communication Agency production: "A Day of Solidarity"; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

By. Mr. MATHIAS:

S.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution designating February 11, 1982, "National Inventors' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. Biden, Mr. Baucus, Mr. DeConcini, Mr. Denton, Mr. Dole, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Hayakawa, Mr. Heflin, Mr. Helms, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Mathias, and Mr. Metzenbaum):

S.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution designating February 7 through February 13, 1982, as "National Crime Prevention Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BAKER:

S. Res. 285. Resolution to extend the reporting date of the study group on the commemoration of the U.S. Senate bicentenary; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. McCLURE:

S. Res. 286. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

S. Res. 287. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Environment and Public Works; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PACKWOOD:

S. Res. 288. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. Res. 289. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Rules and Administration; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. Res. 290. An original resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the "Senate Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document; from the Committee on Rules and Administration; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. Res. 291. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Finance; from the Committee on Finance; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. Res. 292. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Appropriations; from the Committee on Appropriations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. Res. 293. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on the Budget; from the Committee on the Budget; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WEICKER:

S. Res. 294. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Small Business; from the Committee on Small Business; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PERCY:

S. Res. 295. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Foreign Relations; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ROTH:

S. Res. 296. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by the Committee on Governmental Affairs; from the Committee on Governmental Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. Res. 297. Resolution relating to a usury ceiling; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. Domenici):

S. Res. 298. Resolution to honor and commend Martin L. Skutnik for his courageous act of rescue in the aircraft disaster in Washington, District of Columbia, on January 13, 1982; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICKER (for himself and Mr. Nunn):

S. Res. 299. Resolution to designate May 4, 1982, as "International Franchise Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Durenberger, Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Schmitt, Mr. Tsongas, Mr. D'Amato, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Bumpers, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Exon, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Levin, Mr. Gorton, Mr. DeConcini, Mr. Eagleton, and Mr. Biden):

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution concerning tax-exempt status of private schools; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

S. Con. Res. 60. Concurrent resolution disapproving the Federal Trade Commission trade regulation rule relating to the sale of used motor vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Jackson):

S. 2018. A bill to authorize the presentation on behalf of the Congress of a specially struck gold medal to Adm. Hyman George Rickover; read twice and ordered held at the desk.

(The remarks of Mr. Warner and Mr. Jackson on this legislation appear earlier in today's Record.)

By Mr. BUMPERS (for himself, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Robert C. Byrd, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Heflin, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Levin, Mr. Sasser, Mr. Exon, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Long, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pell, Mr. Metzenbaum, Mr. Pryor, Mr. DeConcini, Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Chiles, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Ford):

S. 2019. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay certain burial and funeral expenses of certain veterans and to provide a cemetery plot allowance for certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

BURIAL AND FUNERAL EXPENSES OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Veterans' Burial Benefits Amendments Act of 1982. This measure will restore the traditional $300 burial and funeral expenses benefit for all honorably discharged wartime (including Korea and Vietnam) veterans that was stripped away last October 1.

Mr. President, all this bill does is restore the law to the pre-reconciliation stage. By changing the eligibility criteria, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act drastically reduced the number of veterans who can be assured of a dignified burial; benefits are now available only for those veterans who were entitled to receive VA compensation or pensions. In fiscal year 1981, before reconciliation, almost 361,500 veterans received the burial allowance, and the total cost of the program was about $113.6 million. Although the Veterans' Administration does not know exactly how many veterans will now be denied their allowance, the program has been slashed by $75.2 million in budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 1982. It will be cut by $79.8 million in fiscal year 1983, and $84.4 million in fiscal year 1984.

Unless we move quickly to restore this benefit, thousands of indigent veterans may be denied a decent burial. For example, officials estimate that in Los Angeles County alone, 1,000 destitute veterans will die this year. Under the revised law, they will no longer be automatically eligible for the burial allowance, even if they fought for this country in wartime and were honorably discharged. The unburied remains of a number of these men have already accumulated in Los Angeles just since the cutbacks took effect 3 months ago. Our veterans deserve better, and we cannot count on financially strapped State and local governments to meet these new and unexpected demands.

Also, without the allowance, the families of tens of thousands of veterans will now be forced to bear the entire burden of spiraling funeral expenses. The State veterans affairs department in Arkansas, my home State, estimates that five out of six veterans in Arkansas will lose this benefit. I suspect that the benefit loss is comparable in almost every other State. Today, there are more than 26 million American war veterans, some 3.5 million of which are 65 years of age or older. We have an obligation to those who were prepared to make the supreme sacrifice for the Nation. They have earned this small benefit, and the Government has promised to provide it. Now is hardly the time to renege on that promise.

In seeking the support of my colleagues for this bill, I ask them to reflect on the comments of Teddy Roosevelt in a speech he made in Springfield, Ill., on July 4, 1903:

> A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. More than that no man is entitled to, and less than that no man shall have.

Mr. President, simply stated, it was a mistake to limit eligibility for this benefit. Our veterans deserve more. All of us want to balance the budget, but this is the wrong place to do it. The budget impact of this bill pales in comparison to the misery it will relieve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Veterans' Burial Benefits Amendments Act of 1982; an article describing the effects of the cutbacks in burial benefits in Los Angeles, taken from the January 13, 1982, edition of the Washington Post, along with a letter from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors; and an article from the January 22, 1982, edition of the Arkansas Gazette describing the likely effects on Arkansas veterans.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUMPERS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Arkansas for his leadership on this issue, and I wish to join him as a cosponsor of this measure.

I think that what is being done to the veterans of this country by the Reagan administration and by the insensitivity and the lack of concern and response to their proper needs is a terrible thing. It is something we must deal with and something we must correct, and I want to work with the Senator from Arkansas to accomplish that.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, the Senator has been listed, and I have shown him as a cosponsor of the bill. I thank the Senator very much for his remarks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 902(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "When a veteran dies who was in receipt of compensation (or but for the receipt of retirement pay would have been entitled to compensation) or in receipt of pension, the Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of a veteran who dies and—

"(1) such veteran's death resulted from a service-connected disability, or

"(2) such veteran was (A) a veteran of any war, (B) discharged from the active military, naval, or air service for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty, or (3) in receipt of (or but for the receipt of retirement pay would have been entitled to) disability compensation,

the Administrator".

Sec. 2. Section 903(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "who was discharged from the active military, naval, or air service for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty, or who is a veteran of any war" after "such subsection".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect with respect to deaths occurring after September 30, 1981.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1982]

CUTBACKS IN VA BURIAL FUNDS STIRS EMOTIONS

(By Al Senia)

Los Angeles, Jan. 12—The remains of 30 destitute men believed to be American veterans remain unburied in the Los Angeles County coroner's office because of cutbacks three months ago in the Veterans Administration funeral allowance program.

The plight of the impoverished veterans—officials are unsure of the precise number because fingerprint checks have not been completed—has ignited an emotional debate over the proper role of the federal government and the impact of President Reagan's budget cuts on state and local governments.

Last summer's budget reconciliation bill cut the funeral allowance for the families of most veterans by $300; only wartime veterans receiving pensions or disability pay remained eligible for this benefit. That left the families of other veterans with a $150 allowance that must be applied to the cost of a burial plot, not to such other items as mortuary costs or transportation to a gravesite.

VA officials said other cities soon may find themselves with the same problem as Los Angeles: a collection of bodies and a shortage of funds to pay for their burial. Since October, the VA has continued to pay for the burials for those who died before the cutoff date, but by next month, it expects to have verified most of those who died before Oct. 1. Then, county and city governments will be forced to come up with the funds.

Marvin Page, a spokesman for the VA's Veterans Fund Service in California, said the VA has begun assessing the problem of "body held cases" throughout the United States. But no figures are available from other cities because a report is not expected until early February, Page said.

Robert Kingsbury, director of the Los Angeles County veterans affairs office, said of the situation: "I'm appalled. I think somebody [in Washington] forgot to do their homework." He predicted the number of indigent vets in the county who will die without receiving the larger burial allowance will reach 1,000 by the end of the year. Los Angeles County has more veterans than any other county in the nation.

The VA was unable to provide statistics on the number of veterans in the country who received burial allowances last year. Nationwide, there are 3.5 million veterans over 65.

Kingsbury said the remains of the indigent wartime veterans would have to be cremated or buried in paupers' graves if the funds were not restored. The latter action, though, would require a change in California law. Dan Wolf, press secretary for Los Angeles County Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, said today that at least one veteran's body was being transported to a local crematorium. But a temporary solution was found when Henry Rushing, a 38-year-old Santa Rosa, Calif., businessman and an Army veteran, provided the $9,000 to bury the man.

"At first I thought it was just the Veterans Administration and the county trying to get more money," he said. "Then I checked it out. I was just brought up to be very patriotic. I grew up in the oil fields. I feel we owe a great deal to the people who fight our wars for us."

Rushing, a self-described Reagan supporter, says he understands the cutback. "I'm not so sure it's a federal responsibility. I don't think it's the government's place anymore to be burying [individuals]. I agree wholeheartedly with Reaganomics." He said veterans groups, churches and private industry would be better suited to provide for the indigent veterans.

But William Bridges, who has made funeral arrangements in Los Angeles County for thousands of veterans in the past, disagrees. A division chief of the county's office of public administration, Bridges said, "The pattern being set down is that the federal government has pushed the problem down to the local governments. You can ask philosophically if it's the federal government's responsibility to pay the funeral benefits for private individuals. But to pass down the responsibility after carrying it for so many years . . . you can see the problem. We're talking about a significant financial impact."

County of Los Angeles,
Board of Supervisors,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 20, 1982.

Hon. Dale Bumpers,
Senate Appropriations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Bumpers: I would like to update and clarify my letter of January 13, regarding the burial of indigent veterans.

I wrote that there were expected to be an estimated 1,000 indigent veterans who will die in Los Angeles County in 1982. I also indicated that there were currently 30 veterans in the county morgue for whom no burial funds would be forthcoming from the federal government. This latter figure is not totally accurate since it takes four to five months for the FBI and Veterans Administration to postively verify a veteran's identity and the new law concerning veteran burials only affects veterans who have died since October 1, 1981. However, once this lag time is passed, we anticipate that numerous veterans will be identified as not eligible for government-funded burials.

These veterans who will die in Los Angeles County without friends, family, or money and for whom there will be no funding available from the federal government deserve a decent, dignified burial as a final act of respect from the nation for which they were prepared to risk their lives.

Very truly yours,

Kenneth Hahn,
Supervisor, Second District,
County of Los Angeles.

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Jan. 21, 1982]

LOSS OF VETERANS BURIAL BENEFIT AFFECTS 231,800 IN ARKANSAS

About five in six Arkansas veterans will have lost burial benefits unless President Reagan or the Congress reverses the budget cut that ended those funds, according to a spokesman for the state Veterans Affairs Department.

William L. Skains, the Department's assistant director, said many veterans lost a benefit that entitled them to a $300 burial allowance and up to $150 toward a burial plot. Of the 275,000 to 277,000 wartime veterans now living in Arkansas, about 45,000 retain the burial benefit under the current criteria. Skains said that about 231,800 Arkansas veterans had lost the benefit.

The burial benefit, formerly extended to all honorably discharged wartime veterans, has been available since October 1, the start of federal fiscal 1983, only to disabled veterans, those who are receiving pensions, retirement pay or other compensation, and those who had claims for veterans compensation pending at the time of death.

Skains said that 19,000 to 20,000 Arkansas veterans now receive pensions, and that about 26,000 more receive compensation for service-related disabilities.

Senator Dale Bumpers (Dem., Ark.) said last week that his office was having legislation drafted to restore the burial benefit if the Reagan administration decides not to do that on its own initiative.

On a related topic, Skains said that most plots had been taken at Arkansas's national cemeteries, where many veterans seek to be buried. He said there had been some interest in having the state establish a veterans' cemetery.

RESTORING BENEFITS FOR AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the legislation offered today by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Bumpers, which would restore the $300 burial benefit for all our wartime veterans, including the men who served in Korea and Vietnam. I commend Senator Bumpers on his worthwhile and appropriate initiative on behalf of American veterans, and I hope that the Senate will act on this measure expeditiously and pass it into law this session.

This initiative will correct a grievous slight which has been done to the men who have answered the call to risk the supreme sacrifice on behalf of the Nation. It is all the more appropriate that this traditional benefit be restored for those men who answered the call during the Vietnam conflict when many chose not to serve.

The problem that Senator Bumpers has drawn to our attention results from misguided efforts to achieve small cost-savings during consideration of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act passed during the last session. That act changed the eligibility criteria for those veterans who would be eligible for the $300 burial benefit, so that only those veterans who were entitled to receive VA compensation or pensions could receive the allowance. This reduces the eligible veteran population by perhaps two-thirds.

If we do not act quickly to reinstate the full benefit, thousands of families will be hard put to bear the burden of funeral expenses, expenses which have been just as hard hit by inflation as the rest of our economy. Can the States be expected to pick up this burden? Hardly. It is a national disgrace that the unburied remains of dozens of veterans have accumulated in Los Angeles, for example, since the cutback in these benefits took effect last October 1.

Surely, the criteria for the new reduced benefit has absolutely nothing to do with national service. All veterans who were honorably discharged were previously eligible. Honorable service was the criteria. It should continue to be the criteria. Upon what possible rationale can we justify that some honorably discharged veterans are eligible for burial benefits but that most are not? The revenue effect of the full benefit is little enough. Senator BUMPERS cites it as about $113 million, I believe, in fiscal year 1981. The cost-savings of the action taken in the Omnibus Reconciliation Act would be some $75 million in fiscal year 1982. Is this extremely modest cost-savings enough to justify stripping away a decent burial from those who served? It cannot possibly be justified. The effect of reducing the benefit is an insult to those men and their families who had been led to expect this modest but important benefit.

I believe the reduction in this benefit was totally misguided and should be rectified as soon as possible. I hope that the Veterans Committee will give it priority attention and report it back to the full Senate early in the present session, so that this misguided action can be reconciled.

WARTIME VETERANS' BURIAL AND FUNERAL BENEFITS

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor the bill offered by my colleague from Arkansas, Senator BUMPERS, to restore the traditional $300 burial and funeral benefit to all honorably discharged wartime veterans. Last summer, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act denied this long-standing benefit to honorably discharged wartime veterans who were not qualified for a VA compensation or benefit.

The effect of this provision in the Reconciliation Act is obvious, dramatic, and devastating. Put simply, under that legislation tens of thousands of American military veterans will not receive this small, but meaningful, benefit. Their survivors will be forced to bear not only the burden of the loss of a loved one, but also the entire burden of the spiraling funeral expenses. In many cases it will be the financially hard-pressed State and local governments who will be forced to accept yet another burden that the National Government has chosen to abandon.

And this is more than simply a monetary burden. The veterans affected are brave Americans who served their Nation honorably in time of war. What a blow it will be to them and their families for the United States to ignore and forget their military service.

The administration is eager to spend billions of dollars on ever more exotic and destructive weapons—but it cannot find $300 to help bury an American wartime veteran.

It gives the giant oil companies $33 billion in new tax breaks and then takes from these brave men and women $300. It asks veterans to surrender their small burial benefits as an "economizing" measure, while it provides massive military aid to military dictatorships and major tax breaks to the wealthy.

This situation is unacceptable. I have cosponsored Senator BUMPER's bill because the promises America made to its wartime veterans must be fulfilled. Support of the military does not mean just buying new hardware, building new bases, or recruiting new personnel. It means supporting the people who serve—not just when they serve, but after their service is ended.

That is the standard Abraham Lincoln set in the words of his second inaugural address, when he said:

> With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

That is the standard we must meet today, and that is the standard we are seeking in this bill.●

By Mr. KASTEN (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HAYAKAWA, and Mrs. HAWKINS):

S. 2020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the individual income tax rate reductions enacted by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 for 1982 and subsequent years shall take effect 6 months sooner than scheduled under such act; to the Committee on Finance.

INCOME TAX RATE REDUCTION

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, when I was running for the Senate, and when Ronald Reagan was running for the Presidency, we both campaigned on the Kemp-Roth program—a 10-percent personal tax cut in January of 1981, 10 percent in January of 1982, and 10 percent in January of 1983. If Congress had passed that original package, personal tax rates would be down by 20 percent today. Instead, Congress cut tax rates by only 5 percent late in 1981, and that tax relief has been wiped out by bracket creep and already scheduled social security tax increases.

Today, I am introducing a bill which is identical to the one Representatives ROBERT WALKER and JACK KEMP introduced in the House 2 months ago. It would simply put the original Reagan tax cut back in place with a 10-percent cut effective January 1, 1982, and a 10-percent cut effective January 1, 1983.

All economists agree that we cannot tax our way out of a recession. Most agree that we must increase economic activity through some form of fiscal stimulus—the question is whether it should be Government spending or private sector spending. Well, we have tried to solve our problems with more and more Government spending, and it has not worked.

I believe we can battle the recession best with increased spending in the private sector. Instead of reopening the floodgates for Government programs, it is time to restore the incentives for work, saving, investment, and job creation. The Reagan personal tax rate reductions will work as soon as average Americans see a significant reduction in the marginal tax rate and the corresponding increase in their take-home pay.

That has not happened yet and it can only happen when Congress votes to speed up the Reagan tax cuts.

I believe that deficits do matter, that they are part of the reason for high interest rates today. I believe that Congress must take immediate action to get the Federal budget under control. We should subject defense spending to the same kind of scrutiny we gave social programs last year. We should adjust the cost-of-living schedule for entitlement programs. And if we have to raise revenues, we could repeal the inequitable leasing provisions included in last year's tax bill, institute user fees, and plug unwarranted loopholes in our Tax Code.

But it is even more important to attack Federal deficits at their source; namely, the recession.

The oversized deficits we face in 1982 and 1983 are a direct result of the declining economy. According to the Congressional Budget Office, every percentage point drop in gross national product increases the deficit by more than $60 billion; every percentage point increase in unemployment increases the deficit by $25 billion. The only way to get deficits under control is to limit Federal spending and, at the same time, promote strong economic growth and job creation.

In a recent interview President Reagan stated that the recession "might not have happened" if Congress had passed his original tax cut package. I agree, and I believe we can propel the economy out of this recession by going back to the original Kemp-Roth-Reagan tax cut schedule.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the

Record at this point a table showing the budget effects of moving forward by 6 months its effective date of the tax cut.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EFFECTS ON BASELINE BUDGET PROJECTIONS OF MOVING FORWARD THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE NEXT 2 PHASES OF THE TAX CUT BY 6 MO (ALT1)

[Billion of dollars]

	1982	1983
Outlays:		
Decrease due to higher growth ¹	−1.2	−1.0
Decrease due to lower unemployment ²	−2.8	−3.3
Net Change in Outlays	−4.0	−4.3
Receipts:		
Loss due to speed-up	−16.7	−17.2
Gain due to higher growth ¹	+2.0	+2.4
Gain due to lower unemployment	+4.8	+5.1
Net Change in Receipts	−9.9	−9.7
Deficit:		
Increase due to speed-up	+16.7	+17.2
Decrease due to higher growth ¹	−3.2	−3.4
Decrease due to lower unemployment ²	−7.6	−8.4
Net Change in Deficit	+5.9	+5.4

¹ Real growth is 0.4 percentage points higher in 1982 and 0.2 percentage points higher in 1983 in ALT1 than if the tax cut took effect as scheduled.

² The unemployment rate is 0.4 percentage points lower in 1982 and 0.3 percentage points lower in 1983 in ALT1 than if the tax cut took effect as scheduled.

Note.—The effect on the baseline projections of changes in economic assumptions is derived from the July 1981 CBO Report "Baseline Budget Projection."

Source: U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Forecast Center.

By Mr. BAKER (for Mr. Domenici):

S. 2021. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal lands in New Mexico and for the acquisition of certain other lands in Bernalillo County, N. Mex., to be purchased with the proceeds from the disposal of such Federal lands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

WILDERNESS LANDS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which will assist in the aquisition of wilderness lands for our national forest system.

In 1978, the U.S. Congress authorized the aquisition of land known as the Elena Gallegos tract for inclusion into the Cibola National Forest in New Mexico. In 1980 the Congress authorized putting this tract into the Sandia Wilderness.

For many years the Forest Service has been attempting to acquire this land because they recognize that the land is characteristic of eveything an American thinks about when they think of a wilderness area.

This parcel will be an important addition to our wilderness system and I believe this Congress should do everything possible to see that the acquisition takes place.

Because we have waited so long to acquire this land the cost escalated and the acquisition was reauthorized by the Congress. In an effort to stabilize the cost of this parcel of land the city of Albuquerque entered into an option to purchase the property with the owners of the land. That action has stabilized the cost and this bill will allow this project to move forth.

This legislation provides a means for acquisition that differs from traditional methods. Simply stated this bill tells the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to identify excess land under their control in New Mexico and then to sell those lands. The proceeds of those sales would be used for the purchase of land in the Elena Gallegos tract.

Currently in New Mexico the Federal Government controls over 34 percent of the land. I feel very strongly that there is enough surplus land that could be disposed of by sale to provide the needed revenue to fund the acquisition of the tract. The city of Albuquerque has already committed over $5.4 million for this land acquisition and the State another million. I think in light of General Accounting Office reports calling for new techniques of acquiring land for the Federal Government that this legislation meets that criteria.

This Nation cannot afford to lose this valuable national asset. I think that innovative methods of acquisition are needed and innovations that take into consideration large tracts of Federal land in the Western States are needed.

This legislation addresses both problems which are interrelated. It offers the Forest Service a method to acquire land that is needed for maintaining our public lands.

During the 96th session of Congress a bill addressing similar problems in the Lake Tahoe Nevada-California area was passed. We are applying that concept to New Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2021

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are authorized and directed to dispose of lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in the State of New Mexico in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Such disposal shall be in accordance with regulations developed jointly by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the affected local governmental jurisdictions and shall be consistent with the provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and other applicable law, except to the extent necessary to expeditiously carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) Notwithstanding, subsection (a), the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the affected local governmental jurisdictions shall jointly select lands to be offered for sale under this Act. In the event agreement cannot be reached on a joint selection, no land shall be offered for sale.

(c) (1) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the revenues from the sale of public lands under this section shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be deposited annually in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

(2) The revenues deposited in the general fund of the Treasury under paragraph (1) are deemed to be in the nature of repayment for those authorizations set forth in section 2 of this Act. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit an accounting report biannually of income and expenditure provided by this Act to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to acquire by donation, purchased with donated or appropriated funds, or otherwise, up to 7461.34 acres of lands and interest in lands located in Bernalillo County, New Mexico to be included in the Sandia Mountain Wilderness as authorized in section 1 of Public Law 95-61[illegible]. Lands acquired under this section shall be administered as a part of the National Wilderness Preservation System in accordance with Public Law 95-237.

By Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Pell, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Packwood, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Biden, Mr. Chafee, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Long, Mr. Riegle, and Mr. Sarbanes):

S. 2022. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

COAST GUARD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am introducing an emergency measure today to correct a serious budgetary shortfall for the U.S. Coast Guard. As a result of the blind application of across-the-board cuts in December's continuing resolution, operating expense appropriations fell $46 million shy of the level originally proposed for fiscal year 1982 by the administration. A few days ago we learned what this means in practical terms.

The seagoing fleet, already woefully inadequate in size, will lose 10 more cutters. Military personnel strength, certified by GAO and other authoritative studies to be thousands short, will be diminished by 3,500 more personnel. Stations for vessels and aircraft, boating safety detachments, district headquarters, and many other offices all over the country will be closed or reduced. Vessel traffic service systems will be closed in all but three ports. Coast Guard efforts in boating safety, aids to navigation, oceanographic research, equipment maintenance, and training will be curtailed substantially. These actions will be carried out by April 1 unless we take preventive steps.

I have worked with the Coast Guard closely over the years and I can assure you that waste, fraud, and abuse are foreign to its operations. For at least a decade underfunding has chopped every bit of fat away and is now biting into sinew and bone. Coast Guardsmen laboring faithfully away during 100-hour workweeks find their morale fading steadily in the face of frustrations over inadequate and overage equipment, insufficient maintenance, and decreasing manpower.

This bill calls for a supplemental appropriation of $46.3 million for operating expenses to head off the proposed actions by April 1. I note that substantial additional supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1982 will be needed to accommodate such things as military and civilian pay raises, fuel cost increases, and increases in military entitlements and other benefits. Those matters are normally taken up in the spring as part of the overall package of supplemental appropriations and rescissions. I am not suggesting that we depart from that traditional practice, and trust my colleagues on the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee will inquire into those questions with customary care and wisdon.

This $46.3 million bill needs to be considered by the Appropriations Committee as soon as possible. The usual schedule for supplemental appropriations is too slow to turn around the planned reductions in services. Lives may be lost. Our fishermen in South Carolina, for example, begin their fishing activities in April and if these cutbacks occur and the Savannah air station is closed, there won't be a search and rescue helicopter within hundreds of miles. If our fishermen's vessels go down, only heaven will be able to help them.

Mariners all over the country will encounter similar life-and-death consequences from these cuts. Also marine law enforcement will suffer. This will have an adverse economic impact on domestic fishermen because we will have less ability to insure that foreign fishermen do not take more fish from our waters than they are lawfully permitted to. It will also have moral implications for our coastal communities now swamped in a flood of smuggled drugs, for the flood will surge as enforcement drops off.

As I mentioned earlier, this bill would raise Coast Guard operating expenses to the level proposed by the administration in March 1981. Further, it would bring operating expenses almost to the level decided upon by the conferees on the Transportation appropriations bill, which was $1,405 million. Mr. President, we think the conferees were correct in that decision. The shortcomings of across-the-board cuts are highlighted by these extensive base closings, vessel decommissionings, and personnel reductions. We should correct our error.

I want it clearly understood, however, that I intend to work with the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation in this matter. While I respect Senator **Andrews'** position, I believe this legislation is necessary given the life-and-death situation which will be created along our coasts as a result of the action proposed by the Coast Guard. I am confident that we will be able to reach an agreement which will reverse the situation in the next few weeks.

● Mr. **MITCHELL.** Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator **Hollings** today in proposing that an emergency supplemental appropriation be enacted so that urgently required operating expense funds may be forthcoming for the Coast Guard.

These funds are necessary to prevent the immediate closure of Coast Guard search and rescue stations, marine documentation offices, and other important Coast Guard installations around our Nation. With the addition of the $46 million we are proposing, the Coast Guard operating expense account will be brought back up to the level of funding which the Administration initially sought last March.

This emergency funding measure constitutes only the first step toward placing the Coast Guard on sound financial ground during this fiscal year. As the following briefing paper indicates, substantial unanticipated operating expense costs exist which were not factored into the administration's March request. I will be joining with other Members of this body in urging that the bulk of these items be funded in a omnibus supplemental package.

Sooner or later, the Congress is going to have to face up to the question of adequately funding the Coast Guard. The situation before us was excellently described last year by the Coast Guard Commandant in his annual state of the Coast Guard address. The Commandant states:

> Our capital plant is unacceptable, especially our ships, boats and shore facilities, and some of our aircraft. It has been difficult to overcome the political reality that program priorities, on the road to Congress, are determined by high visibility, short-term payback, and relatively narrow but politically opportune emotional issues.
>
> For this, and a variety of other reasons we find ourselves at somewhat of a strategic disadvantage with respect to resources, precisely at a time when our country needs our capability the most. We do not have the people or dollars to support our missions properly and we cannot expect our people to continue responding reasonably under unreasonable conditions.

The Commandant made that statement 1 year ago. Earlier this month the Coast Guard acknowledged that it will have to eliminate 3,500 personnel slots. And then last week, the nationwide list of facilities closures was announced.

In my own State, one search and rescue station at Eastport was designated for closure as were Maine's two marine documentation offices in Rockland and Portland, a recruiting center in Bangor, and an examination center in Portland.

Congress has an obligation to reverse this trend. Our domestic fishing industry is looking to us for prompt action. So too are the millions of recreational boaters who depend on the Coast Guard for assistance in times of distress. We must act expeditiously.

I urge that the Committee on Appropriations give our proposal its most prompt and serious consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the information document listing those items which were not factored into the administration's March request be printed in the Record.

There being no objection the document was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

1. LEGISLATIVELY MANDATED BENEFITS, $15,000,000

Legislatively mandated benefits recently enacted by Congress have created a requirement for increased funding. The Military Pay and Allowance Benefits Act, Public Law 96-579, increased the monthly rate for career sea pay, extended certain entitlements, and provided a career sea pay premium for members who have served sea duty for more than 36 months consecutively. Funding required to provide this entitlement is $8,600,000. Effective 1 January 1981, Public Law 96-579 provided eligibility for BAQ to single members in pay grade E-7 and above stationed aboard ships. Funding of $700,000 is required to pay monthly BAQ for approximately 280 eligible members. The Defense Officer Personnel Management Act, Public Law 96-513, provides for substantial changes in basic allowance for subsistance (BAS) and per diem for enlisted personnel. While $9,700,000 is required to pay these entitlements, $4,000,000 will be absorbed. A recent change to the Joint Travel Regulations (JTR) authorizes 16 cents per mile in lieu to 7 cents per mile for members in a Permanent Change of Station status. The full $1,800,000 required to fund this increase will be absorbed.

2. ENERGY COST INCREASE, $11,000,000

The Coast Guard is currently buying approximately 49 percent of its fuel from local contractors under government contracts and the remainder from Defense Fuel Supply Center (DFSC) inventories. In addition, significant purchases of utilities, primarily electricity and natural gas, are made from local sources. Since the beginning of fiscal year 1981, some geographic areas have experienced a cost increase of as much as 29 percent for fuel bought from local contractors. Effective 1 October 1981, the Defense Fuel Supply Center increased their fiscal year 1982 bulk petroleum prices approximately 12 percent. Similarly utility prices have increased 29 percent overall. These price increases result in an increased funding requirement of $11,883,000 above COL allowances in spite of temporarily stable energy prices and continued efforts to conserve energy; $883,000 will be absorbed.

3. HU-25A FOLLOW-ON, $4,000,000

A number of HU-25A aircraft are scheduled to become operational during fiscal year 1982. Funding of $7,759,000 would be required to operate these aircraft at the planned utilization rate of 1,000 hours per aircraft year. This request will fund a current year utilization rate of 650 hours per aircraft per year. This increase is the net of the cost reduction achieved from retirement of the HU-16E and HC-131A aircraft.

4. MISCELLANEOUS COST INCREASES, $8,000,000

Funds are required to pay for: (1) two U.S. Postal Service rate increases effective 22 March 1981 ($522,000) and 1 November 1981 ($319,000); (2) a GSA Standard Level User

Charge (SLUC) rate increase ($1,815,000); (3) increased charges for services provided by the Transportation Computer Center (TCC), resulting from equipment replacement and increased system usage ($1,831,000); (4) conversion of Coast Guard computer programs to new equipment procured by TCC ($950,000); (5) recent rate increases for communications, including those for leased land lines, WATS, and FTS intercity dedicated data circuits, as well as elimination of the TELEPAK bulk discount rate ($5,649,000); and (6) medical cost increases, to include anticipated additional charges by DOD medical facilities beginning in fiscal year 1981 for outpatient treatment provided Coast Guard active duty personnel ($1,806,000), and medical cost increases greater than the standard allowance for cost of living ($1,300,000). Coast Guard will absorb $9,286,000 of the above cost increases.●

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator HOLLINGS as a cosponsor of legislation that would restore $46.3 million in badly needed funds to the operating budget of the U.S. Coast Guard.

Congress originally appropriated $1.3 billion for operating expenses for the Coast Guard in fiscal year 1982. While this is $20 million more than the amount appropriated for the previous fiscal year, inflation, higher costs, and unanticipated expenses have increased the Coast Guard's operating budget significantly.

In recent years, the Coast Guard has taken on new, more challenging, and increasingly expensive responsibilities. In addition to the important and traditional rescue missions, the Coast Guard patrols our 200-mile limit for fishing violations by foreign countries, patrols our coastline for drug smugglers, trains seamen, licenses and inspects boats, and assists with boating safety programs.

With these responsibilities, Coast Guard resources and manpower have been stretched to the limit and beyond. Without these funds, the Coast Guard will be forced to lay off 1,000 people by April 1, and an additional 2,400 positions will have to be eliminated by September 30 of this year.

My State of Rhode Island will be hard hit by this shortage of funds. A merchant marine license certification office in Providence will be closed, requiring seamen to travel to Boston for testing, certification, and renewals. Vessel documentation offices in Providence and Newport will be closed. Again, Rhode Islanders will have to travel to Boston for these services.

Rhode Island will also be affected by many of the cuts in the New England region as a whole. A plane stationed at Cape Cod that is used for search and rescue missions, as well as for spotting oil spills, will be decommissioned. Security and boating safety offices in nearby Massachusetts and Connecticut will be closed. Two cutters stationed in New England are being decommissioned—this in addition to the fact that another New England cutter is being used off the Florida coast in search of refugees.

The $46.3 million provided in this legislation will not overcome all of the funding problems hampering the Coast Guard. It will, however, help tide them over this difficult time and help keep many important services such as these from being curtailed.

I am pleased to join with Senator HOLLINGS and other Members of the Senate in support of this bill and am hopeful that we can complete action on this measure quickly.●

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator HOLLINGS and others in sponsoring emergency legislation to help the Coast Guard. The amount contained in Senator HOLLINGS supplemental authorization bill, $46 million, has been identified by the Coast Guard as the immediate shortfall in operational budget authority that forced the drastic cutbacks in services announced last week.

Unless the Congress acts rapidly on this supplemental authorization bill, the Coast Guard will be forced to reduce its enlisted manpower by 8 percent by the end of the fiscal year this September 30; 11 cutters will be decommissioned, 14 search and rescue stations closed, and virtually all recruiting activities will grind to a halt. Additionally, many boating safety offices and other services important to commercial and recreational mariners will be terminated. The effect of these cuts will be widespread indeed, and the most immediate impact will be felt by those at sea whose lives may be imperiled by the loss of vital search and rescue services. Also hard hit will be our fishing industry, which depends on the Coast Guard to enforce restrictions on foreign competition within the 200-mile zone. Fishery surveillance partrols were already cutback by 60 percent on the east coast last May, and the additional loss of cutters and manpower will undoubtably increase violations within the zone and reduce the protection we gave to our fishermen when we established the 200-mile limit in 1977.

A third area where an immediate impact will be felt is the Coast Guard's increasingly important work of combating drug smugglers. By its own estimate, the Coast Guard is stopping less than 20 percent of this traffic, and in areas along the Florida and gulf coasts drug smuggling has become a multibillion-dollar-a-year industry, imposing an intolerable burden on local law enforcement officials. The drug smuggling industry is strongly linked to the national crime epidemic, and cutting the Coast Guard's resources in the war against drugs is truly a false economy.

For years, the Coast Guard has been underfunded and neglected, while the Congress and the administration have heaped many additional responsibilities and tasks, like the Haitian mission, that are a severe drain on already limited resources. The Coast Guard sought $1.4 billion as an operating budget in the fiscal year that began last October 1. It got $46 million less. The current budget is slightly larger than the previous year, to be sure, but adjustments for inflation make the true figure a considerable shortfall.

Without an adequate operating budget, the cuts announced last week will just be the beginning of further reductions in service, and a continuation of the Coast Guard's diminishing ability to save lives at sea, enforce fishing laws, and protect our marine environment. The Coast Guard today is at the crossroads, and the Congress should prevent a further erosion in performance by adopting this emergency supplemental authorization bill. Without it, we are rapidly approaching the day when a disaster will strike, either an oilspill in our waters, or a fishing vessel in trouble, or a boating accident with lives in jeopardy, and the Coast Guard will not be there to respond. The need has never been greater, and the time to act and prevent these cuts from going into effect is very short. Let us commit ourselves to getting the job done by approving this legislation as quickly as possible.●

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 2023. A bill to assist in the admission into the United States of certain aliens who have fled from Poland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POLISH REFUGEES

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, while military repression in Poland continues to thwart the aspirations of the Polish people, and indeed imperils the peace between East and West, refugees from that Soviet-sponsored tyranny continue to stream across the border into Western Europe. According to Sunday's New York Times, more than 50,000 Poles are currently housed in Austria, many in makeshift camps and army barracks.

While the Austrian Government has welcomed this most recent exodus of men and women from Eastern Europe with its now customary warmth and efficiency, Austria is simply unable to accept permanently all of the Polish refugees. And while some of these Poles would surely like to return to their native land, others desire to begin a new life for themselves and their children in the West.

I believe they should be permitted to do so. And I am concerned that the United States has not yet taken adequate steps to provide that opportunity.

I am, therefore, introducing legislation today that would allow thousands of additional Polish refugees to be admitted to the United States as refugees. Congressman BIAGGI of New York is introducing identical legislation today in the House.

In the last 6 weeks alone, more than 1,000 of the Poles in Austria have sought asylum in the United States. Should General Jaruzelski fulfill his promise to relax Poland's passport laws, a veritable flood of refugees could well result. Under current law, however, only 9,000 refugees can be admitted to the United States from all of Eastern Europe—and just 5,000 are expected to be admitted from Poland. This is surely not enough.

The legislation I am introducing today, the Polish Refugee Act of 1982, would provide special authority for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to admit an unlimited number of these individuals fleeing Poland.

A crisis is at hand. Shall the United States be prepared to provide refuge to those gallant men and women who have strived so mightily for 17 months to democratize Poland—and who in consequence must now seek exile during Poland's dark days?

I believe we must. I hope we shall. The Congress can make a significant contribution to this effort by adopting this proposal. I urge my colleagues to study it and to support it.●

By Mr. DOLE (by request):

S. 2024. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prohibit the granting of tax-exempt status to organizations maintaining schools with racially discriminatory policies; to the Committee on Finance.

DENIAL OF TAX EXEMPTION TO RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY PRIVATE SCHOOLS

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, at the request of President Reagan, I am today introducing the administration's bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to deny tax exempt status to racially discriminatory private schools.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IS ABHORRENT

Mr. President, racial discrimination in any form is abhorrent and contravenes the public policy repeatedly reaffirmed by Congress in numerous civil rights measures. In the area of education, invidious racial discrimination has been of particular concern to Congress and the courts. It is equally a matter of grave concern to the President. That is why the President submitted to the Congress this proposed legislation, and urged us to give, in his words, "the very highest priority" to consideration of his bill.

FINANCE COMMITTEE HEARING SCHEDULED

The Committee on Finance has already scheduled a hearing to consider the issue of tax exemptions for private schools that discriminate on the basis of race at 10:30 a.m. on February 1.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESIDENT'S BILL

The President's bill proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide expressly that private schools maintaining racially discriminating policies will not qualify as tax-exempt organizations, and that contributions, gifts, and bequests made to such schools will not be tax deductible. Under present law, there is no explicit provision barring tax exemptions for discriminatory private schools. The only provision of the code dealing with tax exemptions for discriminatory organizations deals exclusively with tax-exempt social clubs.

The President's bill provides a standard for determining the existence of a racially discriminatory policy. The bill forbids racial discrimination in student admissions, scholarship and loan programs, athletic programs and any other educational policies or programs administered by the school. The bill requires a tax-exempt private school to administer all of its programs and policies in a manner that does not discriminate on the basis of race. Racial discrimination is defined broadly as encompassing discrimination on the basis of color or national origin.

RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS

The bill also includes several provisions that address the special concerns of private religious schools, and the concerns we all share with the protection of religious freedom.

First, the bill expressly states that it is wholly inapplicable to schools with exclusively religious curricula. This provision insures that religious seminaries, Sunday schools, and afternoon religious schools are not affected by this legislation. Second, the bill provides that school admissions policies, or programs of religious training or worship, are not deemed discriminatory if they have limitations, preferences, or priorities that are based on religious affiliation or belief. This provision insures, for example, that parochial schools limiting attendance to adherents of a particular religion will not lose their tax exemption. Finally, the bill provides that religious schools discriminating on the basis of race or upon a belief requiring discrimination on the basis of race will be denied their exemption. This provision is designed to insure that religious schools and secular schools are treated the same if they practice racial discrimination.

RETROACTIVITY

The bill provides that the amendments it proposes to the Internal Revenue Code shall apply after July 9, 1970. On July 10 and July 19, 1970, the Internal Revenue Service issued two press releases stating that it would no longer grant tax exemptions to racially discriminatory private schools. These press releases were issued after a three-judge Federal court had issued a preliminary injunction suggesting that it would be unconstitutional to construe the Internal Revenue Code to allow tax exemption for discriminatory private schools. That injunction was subsequently made permanent, as to certain schools in Mississippi, and affirmed by the Supreme Court. By making its provisions retroactive to July 10, 1970, the bill proposes a result that comports with the reasonable expectations concerning the Internal Revenue Code's requirements for tax exemption since July 10, 1970.

Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee will carefully review the provisions of this proposed legislation, and other proposals that may be offered to deal with the problem of private school discrimination. We expect that legislation in this area will be controversial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and President Reagan's letter to me be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2024

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DENIAL OF TAX EXEMPTIONS TO ORGANIZATIONS MAINTAINING SCHOOLS WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES.

Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption from tax) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and inserting a new subsection (j) reading as follows:

"(j) ORGANIZATIONS MAINTAINING SCHOOL WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An organization that normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum (other than an exclusively religious curriculum) and normally has a regularly enrolled body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on shall not be deemed to be described in subsection (c)(3), and shall not be exempt from tax under subsection (a), if such organization has a racially discriminatory policy.

"(2) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this subsection—

"(i) An organization has a 'racially discriminatory policy' if it refuses to admit students of all races to the rights, privileges, programs, and activities generally accorded or made available to students by that organization, or if the organization refuses to administer its educational policies, admissions policies, scholarship and loan programs, athletic programs, or other programs administered by such organization in a manner that does not discriminate on the basis of race. The term 'racially discriminatory policy' does not include an admissions policy of a school, or a program of religious training or worship of a school, that is limited, or grants preferences or priorities, to members of a particular religious organization or belief: *Provided,* That no such policy, program, preference, or priority is based upon race or upon a belief that requires discrimination on the basis of race.

"(ii) The term 'race' shall include color or national origin."

SEC. 2. DENIAL OF DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORGANIZATIONS MAINTAINING SCHOOLS WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES.

(a) Section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to allowance of deductions for certain charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended by adding at the end of subsection (f) a new paragraph (7) reading as follows:

"(7) DENIAL OF DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORGANIZATIONS MAINTAINING SCHOOLS WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES.—No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any contribution to or for the use of an organization described in section 501(j)(1) that has a racially discriminatory policy as defined in section 501(j)(2)."

(b) Section 642 of such Code (relating to special rules for credits and deductions) is amended by adding at the end to subsection (c) a new paragraph (7) reading as follows:

"(7) DENIAL OF DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORGANIZATIONS MAINTAINING SCHOOLS WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES.—No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any contribution to or for the use of an organization described in section 501(j)(1) that has a racially discriminatory policy as defined in section 501(j)(2)."

(c) Section 2055 of such Code (relating to the allowance of estate tax deductions for transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses) is amended by adding at the end of subsection (e) a new paragraph (4) reading as follows:

"(4) No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any transfer to or for the use of an organization described in section 501(j)(1) that has a racially discriminatory policy as defined in section 501(j)(2)."

(d) Section 2522 of such Code (relating to charitable and similar gifts) is amended by adding at the end of subsection (c) a new paragraph (3) reading as follows:

"(3) No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any gift to or for the use or an organization described in section 501(j)(1) that has a racially discriminatory policy as defined in section 501(j)(2)."

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply after July 9, 1970.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1982.

HON. ROBERT DOLE,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are aware, the Department of the Treasury announced on January 8 that the Internal Revenue Service would no longer deny tax-exempt status to private, non-profit educational organizations that engage in racially discriminatory practices but otherwise qualify for such status under the present Internal Revenue Code. That decision reflects my belief that agencies such as the IRS should not be permitted, even with the best of intentions and to further goals that I strongly endorse, to govern by administrative fiat by exercising powers that the Constitution assigns to the Congress.

I have submitted to the Congress legislation which will give the Secretary of the Treasury and the IRS express authority to deny tax-exempt status to private, nonprofit educational organizations with racially discriminatory policies. The legislation recognizes and is sensitive to the legitimate specific needs of private religious schools.

At the time I submitted this legislation, I also indicated my unalterable objection to racial discrimination in any form. Such practices are repugnant to all that our Nation and its citizens hold dear, and I believe this repugnance should be plainly reflected in our laws.

I am confident that you and the other members of the Finance Committee will give this issue the prompt attention it deserves, and I pledge my fullest cooperation in working with you to enact such legislation as rapidly as possible.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.●

By Mr. DURENBERGER:

S. 2026. A bill for the relief of Van Nghiep Tran, Quang Nguyen Tran, and Van Tin Tran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing today a private relief immigration bill for three Vietnamese children. The children, Tran Van Nghiep, age 10, Tran Quang Nguyen, age 9, and Nguyen Van Tin, age 12, have lived for 2 years at the Argyle Four Transit Center in Hong Kong. Their plight is an unusual one because the boys each have a set of parents in Vietnam.

The unfortunate story of these children began in late 1979, when they joined some of their villagers in escaping Vietnam by boat. They arrived in Hong Kong on September 27, 1979, and were then transferred to the Argyle Four Transit Center, where they have remained. The children soon settled into the routine of the camp, began learning English, and took occasional classes.

One of the Vietnamese men who escaped with them was eventually placed with a family in Duluth, Minn. Dan and Sharron Capece and their daughter, Irene were stirred by the accounts they heard of the three children. Despite the financial cost of taking on three more children, the Capeces opened their hearts and their home to the boys. Following appropriate INS procedures, they filed the forms necessary to indicate their willingness and ability to support the boys.

What could have been a routine immigration case became incredibly complicated because the children's parents are alive in Vietnam. Therefore, the boys were not considered orphans. Orphan status would have made it possible for them to enter the United States and be sponsored by the Capeces. The goal of the U.S. Government has been to reunite Vietnamese families whenever possible, preferring that to separation, even when qualified foster parents exist. Tran Van Nghiep's father wrote him, saying that he and his wife were allowing their son to make his own decision about returning to Vietnam. Nguyen Van Tin stated in November 1981, that his parents had written to him and agreed that he could resettle in another country.

The U.S. Government has continued to insist that the children be reunited with their parents, despite the letter received from Nghiep's father and the boys' desire not to return to North Vietnam. Repeated requests to have a visa or a humanitarian parole granted in this rather unique case have been denied.

The British Government offered the boys refugee status, so that they could be moved out the camp where they have now spent more than 2 years of their young and impressionable lives. Cutoff from the emotional ties with their natural families, the boys had looked forward to growing up in a loving American family.

Last week, the deputy director of the refugee camp notified me that the boys were being sent to Britain on January 28. Although the British would grant the children refugee status, they did not yet have a home for them. They would be placed in a youth hostel, similar to a boys home.

I firmly believe that reunification of families is an appropriate policy. But in this case, the parents cannot leave Vietnam, the children do not want to return there, and Nhiep's parents have permitted him to make his own decision. Therefore, if reunification is impossible, sending the children to Duluth seems at once the most logical and most humanitarian thing to do.

I believe the merits of this case are overwhelming. It seems most unfortunate to separate young children from people who are willing and eager to help them, and instead place them in a boys home. The Capeces have corresponded regularly with the children, who are eagerly looking forward to a new life in Duluth. They yearn for stability and permanency. It seems unwise to deny them that opportunity.

Mr. President, I have decided therefore to break a long-standing policy I have of not introducing private relief bills. I urge my colleagues to examine the details of this case. I believe they will find that the boys would be far better off in Duluth, Minn., than in a boys home in the United Kingdom.●

By Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD:

S. 2027. A bill to provide for an accelerated study of the causes and effects of acid precipitation, to provide for an examination of certain acid precursor control technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works

ACID PRECIPITATION ACCELERATED REVIEW AND REPORTING ACT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today a bill to accelerate the concentrated Federal research effort into the causes and effects of acid deposition. I take this step in an earnest attempt to provide a prudent and reasonable alternative to the Senate on the issue of acid deposition.

There are several comprehensive control measures that have been introduced to deal with the effects of acid deposition. While I deeply respect the efforts of those who advocate such measures, I would hope that the Senate would recognize the value of the approach that I am outlining today.

On November 8, 1979, the Senate adopted S. 932, the Energy Security Act. Title VII of this legislation is the Acid Precipitation Program and Carbon Dioxide Study. The acid precipitation program, as enacted, provides for a 10-year, comprehensive and fully coordinated study by an Acid Precipitation Task Force. The task force is an interagency body, jointly chaired by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The task force membership is composed of representatives of virtually every important Federal agency with scientific or regulatory expertise in fields related to the study of acid deposition.

The purpose of the comprehensive study of the causes and effects of acid deposition, to be carried out by the task force, is to provide the Federal Government with a sound, scientific data base concerning acid deposition. Such a data base does not now exist in a form that the scientific community, much less Government officials who are not scientists, can agree represents a totally accurate picture of the phenomenon of acid deposition.

The program established in the Energy Security Act is intended to be the primary building block of the scientific data base that the Federal Government must have before it can presume to act in a rational manner with respect to acid deposition. It is not wise to attempt to apply comprehensive controls on emissions, at considerable cost in dollars and jobs in whatever region is singled out for such controls, until sound, scientifically verifiable information is available.

As the Senate proceeds with the reauthorization of the Clean Air Act, it is becoming clear that pressures to establish comprehensive controls in advance of the results of the Federal acid deposition study are increasing. Those pressures make it all the more necessary for the Senate to consider an alternative course of action. The search by some for an immediate remedy with respect to acid deposition only highlights the need for an acceleration of the Federal research effort.

My bill, which is substantially similar to legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Rahall, requires the task force to complete its efforts at the end of 5 years from the date of enactment of the Energy Security Act. That puts the completion date at June 30, 1985. My bill adds a requirment to the program, as set forth in the Energy Security Act, to provide to the Congress and the President a final report on the information and findings of the task force.

My bill also permits the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to submit recommendations, at the Administrator's discretion, for changes in existing law, if any, to deal with acid deposition at the same time that the final report of the task force is submitted. Any recommendations that the EPA Administrator would submit must be supported by the scientific findings of the task force.

The increased level of effort by the task force is in part made possible by the increase in funding for the task force that was provided by Congress for fiscal year 1982. Funding of this critical undertaking should not be in an impediment to its accelerated completion.

Before the heavy hand of massive new Government regulation falls on the coal-producing and coal-using parts of our country, or on some other section where auto emissions or metal smelters may be more important sources of emissions, we in the Congress and the entire Federal Government must know more.

It should be the goal of the Senate to act when equipped with the best available factual information. When such information is lacking, the Senate is likely to go astray. I urge all my colleagues to consider carefully the prudent course that we must take, and to support my effort to seek a responsible process to deal with the issue of acid deposition.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. Bumpers, Mr. Cranston, and Mr. Matsunaga):

S. 2028. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore eligibility for unemployment compensation for certain ex-servicemembers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR EX-SERVICEMEMBERS

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing a measure which will correct the inequitable treatment of members of the armed services who honorably leave the service but who are ineligible to collect unemployment insurance.

Under the law prior to the enactment of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981, a service member could voluntarily leave military service and still be eligible for federally financed unemployment benefits. In fiscal year 1980, 193,000 ex-service members used these benefits in their transition from military to civilian life. Unfortunately, at the request of the administration, the Reconciliation Act changed this law so that individuals leaving the service after July 1, 1981, are no longer eligible to collect these benefits.

As a result, under this current law, if an individual competently serves his country and is honorably discharged, that individual is totally disqualified from receiving any benefit payments. In contrast, the individual who incompetently served and is ineligible to reenlist is entitled to benefits. Thus, we are penalizing those people who serve their country well while we continue to provide benefits to those who are ineligible to reenlist.

The problem is exacerbated in times of high unemployment such as we see today. Men and women who have served their country well and wish to leave the uniquely demanding life of the military are confronted with a job market that is extremely fragile. Moreover, the pay in the armed services generally not adequate to allow individuals to accumulate savings to tide them through any significant period of unemployment. In that context, last year's hasty change in the law is particularly onerous. Mr. President, I do not think this is how we want to treat our citizens who work to preserve the national defense.

The bill I am introducing today, along with Senators Bumpers, Kennedy, Cranston, and Matsunaga, will repeal the current law and restore the prior law retroactively. Under this legislation, individuals who honorably serve for at least 2 years in the Armed Forces who are unable to find work will be eligible for these benefits to help them in their transition to civilian life. Some individuals who leave the service before 2 years due to hardship discharges, a service incurred injury, or who leave for the convenience of the service will also be eligible for benefits. I sincerely hope that Congress will adopt this legislation for it is both fair to those who serve in the Armed Forces and fair to those of us who are served by the Armed Forces.●

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senators Bradley, Bumpers, and Matsunaga in introducing today section 2028, a bill that would restore eligibility for unemployment compensation for certain ex-service members. The measure would repeal provisions enacted in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981—Public Law 97-35—that disqualify ex-service members for unemployment compensation benefits if they are eligible for reenlistment and, in lieu of those provisions, generally require a 2-year minimum-service requirement.

Under the program of unemployment compensation for ex-service members—the so-called UCX program—federally funded unemployment benefits are provided to former military personnel upon their separation from military service if they meet the unemployment compensation eligibility requirements of the State in which they are living. Prior to the enactment of the 1981 Reconciliation Act last August, the military service of an enlisted person qualified as wages or employment in the determination of eligibility if he or she had served 365 days or more of active duty, or was released sooner because of a service-incurred disability or injury, and was separated under other than dishonorable conditions.

Last year, however, in order to achieve savings, the Senate passed and the Congress enacted a Reagan administration proposal that took the approach that leaving the military—even at the end of a term of enlistment—was considered to be a voluntary quit if the individual was eligible for reenlistment. The effect of the provision is therefore, that this voluntary quit, as in the case of private sector employment, results in disqualification for unemployment compensation. The provision was effective with respect to service members leaving the service after June 30, 1981, but applies only to benefits payable after August 31, 1981, the date of enactment of the Reconciliation Act.

Mr. President, this new criterion is entirely too harsh and was applied retroactively in a most inequitable manner. It works a financial hardship on those individuals who have served this country well and honorably in the military, who have made a commitment to the Nation and who have fulfilled it, and who now are seeking to resume their civilian lives. It prevents ex-service members who cannot find employment immediately upon discharge from receiving unemployment benefits to sustain them during their job search.

In this regard, I would like to bring to Members' attention the testimony of the National Association for Uniformed Services before the Subcommittee on Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation of the House Committee on Ways and Means on October 28, 1981. That testimony describes quite graphically the problems encountered by recently discharged service members, as follows:

> The armed services need a large number of young men and women to enter the service, spend three or four years and then return to civilian life. We should thank those who give these years in service to their country, not punish them. Upon release from active duty, few remain in the proximity of their last duty station. Most return to their place of first enlistment, which is generally where they were born and raised. Because these individuals do not remain near their last duty station it is often impossible for them to seek employment prior to discharge. It is extremely difficult to job hunt in Madison, Wisconsin while stationed at Fort Hood, Texas. The Hawaiian or Alaskan resident has an even greater problem if their last duty station is within these contiguous United States. Many young servicemen and women spend their last service days overseas, and are returned to this country only for outprocessing and discharge. Should these individuals be penalized when they were never afforded the opportunity to seek new employment?
>
> Private sector employees generally have the opportunity to seek a new employer before voluntarily leaving their current employer. Few employees leave an employer without having already secured other employment. Even fewer who do leave a job voluntarily, leave the immediate locale where last employed. This is certainly not true of our service personnel.
>
> Spouses of military personnel are denied unemployment compensation when they leave their job voluntarily to follow their military spouse because of transfer orders or upon discharge from the servive. In these cases, both members of the family are denied an interim source of income pending acceptance of new employment. Denial of benefits to the service member in this instance creates a double hardship.

Further, Mr. President, the new criterion raises a strange anomaly and creates a very serious inequity. It penalizes those individuals who satisfactorily fulfill their military obligations and are offered the opportunity to reenlist but who choose to leave the service and, on the other hand, it rewards those who are not. Those who are not eligible for reenlistment—but who have nonmedical honorable discharges or general discharges under honorable conditions—remain eligible for UCX; that is, for example, those with marginal disciplinary records and those who have failed to demonstrate job proficiency or otherwise prove to be unsuited for military service. In contrast, those who have served faithfully and well are ineligible for UCX. This new criterion, then, seems a cold and unfriendly demonstration of thanks from a country that should be grateful and a vivid example of the administration's misplaced priorities in making cost savings.

The proposal we are introducing today would resolve this problem by removing the reenlistment-eligible test and returning instead to the criteria that existed prior to July 1, 1981, with the addition of a 2-year minimum-service requirement, modeled after the minimum-service requirement incorporated last year by Public Law 97-66 in title 38, United States Code, as a minimum criterion for earning Veterans' Administration benefits. Thus, our measure would make exceptions from the 2-year rule in the case of individuals who had served at least 1 year—the minimum-service criterion applicable prior to July 1, 1981—but less than 2, but who were released—under 10 U.S.C. 1171—for reasons of hardship or under the authority—in 10 U.S.C. 1173—for a up-to-90-day early-out discharge for the convenience of the Government. This relief would be retroactive with respect to discharges on or after July 1, 1981, but only with respect to benefits payable after the date of enactment of our amendment. Thus, an ex-service member who had been discharged after July 1, 1981, and who was determined to be ineligible for UCX benefits, would be eligible for benefits for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of enactment. However, no retroactive benefits would be paid to veterans for periods of unemployment prior to that date.

It should be noted, Mr. President, that the House of Representatives has already proposed and approved remedial legislation for the UCX program. In the closing days of the first session, the House passed H.R. 4961, the proposed Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1981, which contains a provision that would repeal the requirements enacted in the Reconciliation Act and replace them with modified eligibility requirements generally based on prior law. Briefly, under the House proposal, and individual would have to have served a full 2 years of active duty to qualify for UCX benefits. In addition, an ex-service member could not begin receiving benefits until the fifth week following separation from the military and could not receive benefits for more than 13 weeks.

Although the House-passed measure is a significant improvement over the inequity being perpetrated by current law, the bill we are introducing is clearly preferable, we believe. Our bill would not require a 4-week waiting period or place an arbitrary 13-week limitation on the benefits, thus permitting an ex-service member to receive benefits for the same length of time that private-sector employees—and indeed, civilian Federal employees—may receive unemployment benefits. It also avoids the result which the House bill would produce of actually taking away a benefit from those categories of individuals who have excusable reasons for serving less than 2 years, but who would have qualified under the pre-July 1, 1981, statutory minimum-service requirement of 365 days.

Mr. President, with more than 9.4 million Americans now unemployed—613,000 of whom are veterans from the Vietnam era—it makes no sense to me to turn out into the cold, quite literally, individuals who have served our Nation well, leaving them without assistance in the form of unemployment benefits while they seek to resume their civilian lives and to find suitable employment. Unlike many of the civilian labor force unemployed, these returning service members do not have a labor force attachment that, in some cases, facilitates finding a job; the ex-service member may often be starting from scratch in the labor market. And, presently, that labor market is exceedingly tight for all but skilled workers.

To continue the unjust denial of employment benefits to these veterans breaches an important commitment we made to them when they entered the service that, upon completion of their enlistments, these benefits would be available if they, as veterans, were to need them. As the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am very much concerned that the Nation keep such commitments to those who serve. We cannot expect that the Nation's youth will continue to accept the burden of a strong defense if they see the country turn its back on those who served with honor before them.

I urge the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate to take speedy action on our proposal. I will be working closely with the cosponsors of this measure and others who support it to achieve an early enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the measure we are introducing, along with a Cordon rule showing the changes it would make in existing law, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2028

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Clauses (A) and (B) of section 8521(1)(1) of title 5, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(A) that service was—

"(i) continuous for 730 days or more or was terminated earlier because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability; or

"(ii) continuous for 365 days and was either terminated under section 1171 or 1173 of title 10; and

"(B) with respect to that service, the individual—

"(i) was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable; and "(ii) was not given a bad conduct discharge, or, if an officer, did not resign for the good of the service;".

(b) The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to terminations of service on or after July 1, 1981, but only for the purposes of determining eligibility for benefits for weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Changes in Existing Law Proposed To Be Made by S. 2028

[Delete material in brackets; add material in *italics*]

TITLE 5—GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND EMPLOYEES

* * * * *

Chapter 85—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

* * * * *

Subchapter II—Ex-Servicemen

§ 8521. Definitions; Application.

(a) For the purposes of this subchapter—

(1) "Federal service" means active service, including active duty for training purposes, in the armed forces which either began after January 31, 1955, or terminated after October 27, 1958, if—

[(A) that service was continuous for 365 days or more, or was terminated earlier because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability; and]

(A) that service was—

(i) continuous for 730 days or more or was terminated earlier because of an actual service-incurred injury or disability; or

(ii) continuous for 365 days and was either terminated under section 1171 or 1173 of title 10; and

(B) with respect to that service, the individual—

[(i) was discharged or released under honorable conditions;

[(ii) did not resign or voluntarily leave the service; and

[(iii) was not released or discharged for cause as defined by the Secretary of Defense;]

(i) was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable; and

(ii) was not given a bad conduct discharge, or if an officer, did not resign for the good of the service;

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 2029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prohibit the granting of tax-exempt status to private schools with racially discriminatory policies and to require the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain a judicial finding of racial discrimination before terminating or denying tax-exempt status to private schools on the grounds of racial discrimination; to the Committee on Finance.

PRIVATE SCHOOL NON-DISCRIMINATION AND DUE PROCESS ACT OF 1982

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, today I offer legislation to help clear up the confusion surrounding recent actions regarding the tax-exempt status of private religious schools.

Much has been said and written about his issue, and I perceive that some in the media—and some outside the media—are confused.

The President has sent a legislative proposal to Congress, and I understand that my distinguished colleague from Kansas introduced that legislation by request on behalf of the administration today. Furthermore, the Senate Finance Committee has scheduled hearings on this matter for next Monday, February 1.

Since today's session of the Senate is abbreviated due to the joint session to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Roosevelt, I will not take the Senate's time to discuss this bill now. But I will be making further remarks on this bill at a later time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2029

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Private School Non-Discrimination and Due Process Act of 1982".

FINDINGS: DECLARATION OF CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

Sec. 2. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) private schools with a racially discriminatory policy as to students should not be granted tax-exempt status under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and contributions to such schools should not be deductible under section 170 of such Code;

(2) it is the policy of the United States that the granting of Federal tax exemptions and deductions not encourage racial discrimination among citizens, especially with regard to the operation of private schools;

(3) during the 1970's, the Internal Revenue Service exceeded its statutory authority by issuing and enforcing revenue rulings and procedures which denied tax-exempt status to private schools meeting certain criteria of racial discrimination and which denied deductions for charitable contributions to such schools;

(4) such actions were not authorized by section 501 or section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, their legislative histories, or any other Act of Congress;

(5) the financial well-being of many private schools depends on the assurance that contributions to such schools are deductible under the Internal Revenue Code, and any action by the Internal Revenue Service affecting the tax-exempt status of such schools threatens their existence;

(6) the granting of exemptions from Federal taxation does not constitute a subsidy or financial assistance to the beneficiaries thereof, and Acts of Congress which place conditions on the receipt of Federal grants, such as title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, do not apply to organizations solely because they are tax-exempt;

(7) many private schools in the United States are operated by religious organizations or associations and as such are entitled to the free exercise of religion as guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution;

(8) the first amendment to the Constitution requires that Congress exercise utmost care when legislating in areas that may touch on the free exercise of religion, and it bars the Federal Government, in its taxing activities, from excessive entanglements with religious educational institutions;

(9) the liberty of individuals and institutions to observe and practice sincerely held religious beliefs is a civil right, and no educational institution which is religious in character and would not exist except for its religious mission should be denied tax-exempt status on the ground that any such observance or practice does not conform to governmental policy;

(10) the Secretary of the Treasury should be required to bring an action for declaratory judgment in the Federal courts to ascertain whether a private school has a racially discriminatory policy as to students prior to any action affecting the tax-exempt status of, or deductibility of contributions, to such school.

(b) Therefore, Congress determines that—

(1) private schools with a racially discriminatory policy as to students should not be granted tax-exempt status under section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and contributions to such schools should not be deductible under section 170 of such Code, and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should be required to bring an action for declaratory judgment in the Federal courts to ascertain whether a private school has a racially discriminatory policy as to students prior to any action affecting the tax-exempt status of, or deductibility of contributions to, such school.

DENIAL OF EXEMPTION FROM TAX TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES

Sec. 3. Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption from tax) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Private Schools With Racially Discriminatory Policies.—

"(1) In general.—A private school that normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum (other than an exclusively religious curriculum) and normally has a regularly enrolled body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are regularly carried on shall not be deemed to be described in paragraph (3) of subsection (c), and shall not be exempt from tax under subsection (a), if such school has a racially discriminatory policy as to students.

"(2) Definitions.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) Racially discriminatory policy as to students.—A private school has a 'racially discriminatory policy as to students' if it has been found, pursuant to the procedure established by section 7408, intentionally to deny admission to, expel, or provide separate classifications for students on the basis of race, color, or national origin. The term 'racially discriminatory policy as to students' does not include an admissions policy of a school which limits its students to, or grants preferences or priorities to, members of a particular religious organization or belief and does not include any policy, program, or other activity of a school which is limited to members of a particular religious organization, or which is required by any sincerely held religious belief.

"(B) Private school.—The term 'private school' means any privately operated school which meets the requirements of State law relating to compulsory school attendance other than a school offering care or instruction for students solely below the first grade, nursery schools, schools for the blind or deaf, or schools operated solely for the handicapped or emotionally disturbed.".

DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTION TO PRIVATE SCHOOL WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (f) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to allowance of deductions for certain charitable contributions and gifts) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTION TO PRIVATE SCHOOL WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES.—No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any contribution to or for the use of a private school described in section 501(j).".

(b) Subsection (c) of section 642 of such Code (relating to special rules for credits and deductions with respect to estates and trusts) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) DENIAL OF DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTION TO PRIVATE SCHOOL WITH RACIALLY DISCRIMINATORY POLICIES.—No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any contribution to or for the use of private school described in section 501(j).".

(c) Subsection (e) of section 2055 of such Code (relating to the allowance of estate tax deductions for transfers for public, charitable, and religious uses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any transfer to or for the use of a private school described in section 501(j).".

(d) Subsection (c) of section 2522 of such Code (relating to charitable and similar gifts) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) No deduction shall be allowed under this section for any gift to or for the use of a private school described in section 501(j).".

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT PROCEDURE ESTABLISHED

SEC. 5. (a) Subchapter A of chapter 76 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to civil actions by the United States) is amended by redesignating section 7408 as section 7409, and by inserting after section 7407 the following new section:

"SEC. 7408. ACTION TO REVOKE OR DENY TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF PRIVATE SCHOOL ON BASIS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—With respect to a private school (as defined in section 501(j)), the Secretary may not—

"(1) revoke or change the exempt status of a private school under section 501(a),

"(2) deny or withhold approval of an application for exempt status under such section by a private school,

"(3) condition acceptance or approval of an application by a private school for exempt status under such section,

"(4) revoke the advance assurance of exempt status issued to a private school, or

"(5) deny a deduction under section 170 as to contributions made to a private school,

on the grounds that such school discriminates on the basis of race as to students unless a court of the United States, in a civil action for a declaratory judgment brought by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of this section, has found that such school has a racially discriminatory policy as to students.

"(b) PROCEDURE TO BE FOLLOWED BY THE SECRETARY.—Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that a private school has a racially discriminatory policy as to students, the Secretary shall file a civil action for a declaratory judgment in the United States district court for the district in which the private school is located.

"(c) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) EVIDENTIARY STANDARD.—In an action brought under subsection (b), the Secretary shall be required to prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that the private school has adopted a racially discriminatory policy as to students (as defined in section 501(j)(2)).

"(2) No adverse action until school has exhausted appeals.—

In the case of a private school with respect to which a court has found under subsection (a) that it has a racially discriminatory policy as to students, the Secretary shall not deny or revoke its exempt status under section 501 or deny deductions for contributions to such school under section 170 until such organization has exhausted all appeals from the final order of the district court in the declaratory judgment action brought under this section.

"(d) RETENTION OF JURISDICTION; REINSTATEMENT OF STATUS.—The district court before which an action is brought under this section which results in the denial or revocation of exempt status under section 501 or the denial of a deduction under section 170 shall retain jurisdiction of such case, and shall, upon a determination that such school—

"(1) has not had a racially discriminatory policy as to students for a period of not less than a full academic year since such denial or revocation became final, and

"(2) does not have a racially discriminatory policy as to students,

issue an order to such effect and vitiate such denial or revocation. Such an order may be appealed by the Secretary, but unless vacated, be binding on the Secretary with respect to such qualification.

"(e) AWARD OF COST AND FEES TO PREVAILING SCHOOL.—In any civil action brought under this section, the prevailing party, unless the prevailing party is the Secretary, may be awarded a judgment of costs and attorney's fees in such action."

"(f) SECTION TO APPLY ONLY TO SCHOOLS WITH PUBLICLY ANNOUNCED POLICY OF NONDISCRIMINATION—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any private school unless that school has published, in such manner as the Secretary may require, public notice that it does not have a racially discriminatory policy as to students."

(b) The table of sections for such subchapter is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 7408. Action to revoke or deny tax-exempt status of private school on basis of racial discrimination.

"Sec. 7409. Cross references.".

EFFECTIVE DATA

SEC. 6. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to actions taken by the Secretary after the date of enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. BAUCUS:

S. 2031. A bill to provide for a 3-year suspension of the duty on copper scale; to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON COPPER SCALE

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, within the language of the U.S. Customs' tariff item 911.10, pertaining to copper waste and scrap, an anomaly has been created which discriminates against importers of copper rod mill scale from Canada.

It is my belief that public and congressional policy did not intend for this discrimination; quite conversely, the suspension of duty on copper waste imported from Canada is appropriate public policy because the United States is not self-sufficient in the production of refined copper.

Nonetheless, however, the current tariff language discriminates against importers of copper scraps for domestic end-use application; in particular, companies which produce cuprous oxide from the copper scrap item rod mill scale. Currently, importers have to pay a duty of 8 cents per pound of contained copper on all scale imported from Canada; however, a smelter or refiner of the same product would not pay any duty. The existing policy discriminates against imported application for this raw material and presents an additional hardship on companies which import this copper scrap item.

For various reasons resting on technicalities, it is not possible to amend currently existing tariff schedules to compensate for this anomaly.

Acting on the advice of the Department of the Treasury and the Customs Service, the most viable method of assisting American importers of copper rod mill scale to secure duty-free status is to establish a new tariff item number providing for the free entry of this particularly described merchandise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2031

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting in numerical sequence the following new item:

"911.05	Copper scale (provided for in item 603.50, part 1, schedule 6).	Free	No change	On or after the 3-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this item."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

By Mr. SASSER (for himself and Mr. BAKER):

S. 2032. A bill to amend section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, to provide that amounts available as a result of a withdrawal of approval of a portion of the Interstate Highway System may be used to provide operating assistance for mass transportation systems; to the Committee Environment and Public Works.

URBAN MASS TRANSIT COSTS

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today, along with my distinguished colleague Senator BAKER, S. 2032, a bill designed to permit interstate highway transfer funds to be used for the purpose of defraying a part of the operating costs of urban mass transit systems.

Current law permits, through 1983, cities and States to apply to have interstate construction funds set aside for other local uses. But current law stipulates that these funds may only be used for alternative transportation projects and for the purchase of new buses.

Without building the Interstate System, there still remains the job of moving people quickly and efficiently in a metropolitan area. And State and local officials are in the best position on how they must decide to have these funds used. Some areas may use the interstate transfer for the construction of alternative transportation projects, others may buy new transit vehicles, and still others may use a portion of this interstate money to pay, perhaps on an emergency basis, for part of the operating costs of a mass transit system.

But that is a decision that can be best made in our State capitols and local city halls, not here in Washington. S. 2032 permits State and local authorities to use interstate transfer funds for operating assistance if they so desire and it also extends the interstate transfer program through 1988.

Mr. President, the mass transit system in Memphis, Tenn., is in serious condition and faces bankruptcy. The Memphis Area Transit Authority has stated that the system will have to be completely shut down in the next 10 to 12 weeks unless some relief is provided.

The Memphis Transit System already has some of the highest fares of any city in the country. The people of Memphis and Shelby County are already making a tremendous sacrifice to keep the buses running. The bus riders in Memphis, because of a lower per capita income than the rest of the Nation, are paying a greater share of their salaries for mass transit than almost anywhere else in the country.

In addition, local officials are urging the Governor and the State legislature to approve a local-option tax specifically to help finance the mass transit system. Therefore, in my view, not only the citizens and users of the system are doing their fair share but the local leadership of Memphis is trying to work out the problem on the local level.

Mr. President, the bill we introduce today would provide a short-term infusion of funds to the Memphis Transit System in order to give the local community time to work out its own problems. The interstate transfer grant funding, which we would allow to be utilized for operating assistance for mass transit systems, is funding that belongs to the city of Memphis and to Shelby County. These are funds that were specifically earmarked for a highway project in Memphis. This project, the I-40 route through Overton Park, has been withdrawn by the Secretary of Transportation. Under Federal statutes and under longstanding precedent the city of Memphis is eligible to receive interstate transfer grants for substitute projects equal to the amount of the project which was withdrawn—in this case over $300 million.

This bill would give the officials of Memphis and Shelby County the flexibility to utilize these funds on an emergency basis in a manner which addresses the most pressing and vital transportation needs of the area—the need to maintain the solvency of the Memphis Area Transit Authority.

Mr. President, severe cutbacks have already been made in bus schedules and service provided to the citizens of Memphis. Thousands of workers depend on their bus system for transportation to and from work. The very vitality of a large segment of the business community in Memphis and Shelby County depends on an efficient transportation system.

The bill my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator Baker and I introduced today is identical to legislation which has been introduced in the House by Representative Harold Ford. This bill provides the kind of flexibility that is needed in order to assure the very survival of the Memphis Mass Transit System. I would emphasize that this is only a temporary, stopgap measure which allows local officials to utilize these funds until a long-term solution can be found.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation, and I ask unanimous consent that S. 2032 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2032

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "either public mass transit projects involving the construction of fixed rail facilities or the purchase of passenger equipment including rolling stock, for any mode of mass transit, or both," and inserting in lieu thereof "either (A) public mass transit projects involving the construction of fixed rail facilities, the purchase of passenger equipment (including rolling stock) for any mode of mass transit, or the payment of operating assistance for any mode of mass transit, or any combination of such projects, or (B)".

(b) The third sentence of section 103(e)(4) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "1988".●

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S.J. Res. 140. Joint resolution designating February 11, 1982, "National Inventors' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL INVENTORS' DAY

● Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, as all of my colleagues know, article 1, section 8 of the Constitution empowers the Congress to pass laws "to promote the progress of science and useful arts." Today, in line with our constitutional mandate, I introduce a joint resolution to designate February 11, 1982, as "National Inventors Day." The date was chosen to coincide with the birthday of the great American inventor, Thomas Alva Edison.

The Wizard of Menlo Park once described the challenge of his vocation as "one-tenth inspiration and nine-tenths perspiration." Over the years, American inventors have made a tremendous contribution in promoting the progress of science and the useful arts and in maintaining and increasing our planet's standard of living, and I think it is appropriate to designate February 11 as National Inventors' Day of 1982.

Thomas Jefferson, a firm champion of inventors and the author of our country's first major patent law, emphasized that "ingenuity should receive liberal encouragement." Designating a day of recognition and celebration for inventors is one small but valuable way to help provide this encouragement. Since time is short, I urge all of my colleagues to examine the resolution at your earliest convenience, and to join me in this tribute to these deserving Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 140

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in honor of the important role played by inventors in promoting progress in the useful arts and in recognition of the invaluable contribution of inventors to the welfare of our people, February 11, 1982, is hereby designated "National Inventors' Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to celebrate such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself, Mr. Biden, Mr. Baucus, Mr. DeConcini, Mr. Denton, Mr. Dole, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Hayakawa, Mr. Heflin, Mr. Helms, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Mathias, and Mr. Metzenbaum):

S.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution designating February 7 through February 13, 1982 as "National Crime Prevention Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL CRIME PREVENTION WEEK

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, crime, and the fear it creates, is a serious national problem that compromises the quality of life for many Americans. It is a longstanding commitment of mine to seek to reduce the threat that crime represents. As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I will do everything in my power to assure that no possible legislative remedy to the crime problem is overlooked. In my search for answers I have become convinced that there is much that we, as citizens, can do to make our homes and neighborhoods more secure.

In many parts of our country, citizens have begun to fight back against the criminal element. People are learning how to prevent crime by joining with their neighbors, local law enforcement agencies and businesses in creating crime prevention programs. Crime rates have been significantly affected in communities where citizens took the initiative to form neighborhood watch groups. In my own State of South Carolina, for example, there is tremendous public involvement in crime prevention. Every law-abiding citizen benefits from these efforts.

Crime is a national crisis. Reports from the Department of Justice indicate that one-third of all households in the United States were touched by crime in 1980. During that period, there was a violent crime committed every 24 seconds and a property crime committed every 3 seconds. These statistics indicate that police cannot stop crime without community support. Individual citizens must become involved in and take responsibility for crime prevention efforts in their own neighborhoods. It is my sincere belief that we must revitalize and reaffirm national leadership for crime prevention in the community.

I am a strong proponent of neighborhood crime prevention programs. I have offered my support to the Crime Prevention Coalition and their nationwide public awareness campaign to promote community oriented crime prevention activities. The Crime Prevention Coalition is a diverse group of 50 national organizations and Federal agencies that sponsor this campaign. The coalition is funded by the Office of Justice Assistance, Research and Statistics under the U.S. Department of Justice. Representing a partnership among citizens, the community, law enforcement, government, and the private sector, the coalition and the campaign provide national leadership and support for crime prevention efforts all over the country.

There are also 17 States that have formally affiliated with the coalition to further the cause of crime prevention. Including my home State of South Carolina, the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Washington have all joined this important national effort.

The coalition asked me to help them with their efforts to emphasize National Crime Prevention Week. Traditionally held the second week of February, its purpose is to focus public attention on crime and the importance of crime prevention. I feel that this event has never achieved adequate national attention—despite the importance of its objectives.

Accordingly, I encourage the Members of the Senate to support the Crime Prevention Coalition and to join with me in a proclamation to support National Crime Prevention Week. We will thereby renew the commitment of the Senate, and encourage the commitment of the American people, to lessening the destructive impact of crime in our country.

I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 141

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas the high incidence of crime in the United States is detrimental to the general welfare of our Nation and caused feelings of frustration and helplessness among its citizens; and

Whereas people in all parts of America have begun to fight back against crime by learning about crime prevention and by joining with law enforcement agencies to start Neighborhood Watch groups and other programs designed to promote safety in their communities; and

Whereas national attention and leadership is required to cause public recognition of the importance of crime prevention and the need for citizen action; and

Whereas there is a need to support a crime prevention program designed to encourage cooperation for crime prevention among citizens, law enforcement agencies and the private sector; and

Whereas National Crime Prevention Week has been the focus of national public awareness about crime prevention for over 30 years: Now, therefore, be it further

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to designate the week of February 7 through February 13, 1982, as "National Crime Prevention Week", and to encourage all citizens, law enforcement agencies, and private businesses to work together to prevent crime and to seek the return of an environment in which Americans may live and work free of crime and fear.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 604

At the request of Mr. Mathias, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Danforth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide that telephone receivers may not be sold in interstate commerce unless they are manufactured in a manner which permits their use by persons with hearing impairments.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. Domenici, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield) was added as a cosponsor of S. 705, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain national forest system lands, and for other purposes.

S. 1018

At the request of Mr. Chafee, the Senator from Montana (Mr. Baucus), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Rudman), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Hatfield) were added as cosponsors of S. 1018, a bill to protect and conserve fish and wildlife resources, and for other purposes.

S. 1448

At the request of Mr. Mathias, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Cochran) the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Levin), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Proxmire), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis), the Senator from California (Mr. Hayakawa), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Exon), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Pressler), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Ford), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Abdnor) were added as cosponsors of S. 1448, a bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp to commemorate the 70th anniverary of the founding of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. Inouye, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Kasten), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Laxalt) were added as cosponsors of S. 1595, a bill to provide for the designation of income tax payments to the U.S. Olympic Development Fund.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. Mitchell, the Senator from Montana (Mr. Baucus) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to better protect against interstate transport of pollutants, to control existing and new sources of acid deposition, and for other purposes.

S. 1854

At the request of Mr. Durenberger, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1854. A bill to make permanent the exclusion from gross income of national research service awards.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. Mitchell, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Pell), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Tsongas), and the Senator from Maine (Mr. Cohen) were added as cosponsors of S. 1961, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide energy tax credits for equipment used aboard or installed on fishing vessels.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 127

At the request of Mr. Stennis, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Robert C. Byrd) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 127, a joint resolution to grant official recognition to the international ballet competition.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 137

At the request of Mr. Helms, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Humphrey) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 137, a joint resolution to amend the Constitution to preserve the right to life.

SENATE RESOLUTION 253

At the request of Mr. Dole, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Cannon) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 253, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on "National Circle K Week".

SENATE RESOLUTION 261

At the request of Mr. Chafee, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Tsongas), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 261, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should not impose import fees on crude oil and refined petroleum products.

AMENDMENT NO. 1242

At the request of Mr. Mathias, the Senator from Montana (Mr. Baucus) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1242 intended to be proposed to S. 1758, a bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code to exempt the private noncommercial recording of copyrighted works on video recorders from copyright infringement.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 59—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. Durenberger, Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Schmitt, Mr. Tsongas, Mr. D'Amato, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Bumpers, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pell, Mr. Percy, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Exon, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Levin, Mr. Gorton, Mr. DeConcini, Mr. Eagleton, and Mr. Biden) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. Con. Res. 59

Whereas, the Congress provided the legislative basis for denying tax exemptions to private schools that discriminate on the basis of race when it passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Whereas, in 1971, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia stated in *Green v. Connally* that: "The Internal Revenue Code provisions on charitable exemptions and deductions must be construed to avoid frustrations of Federal policy. Under the conditions of today they can no longer be construed so as to provide to private schools operated on a racially discriminatory premise the support of the exemptions and deductions which Federal tax law affords to charitable organizations and their sponsors," and the Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed that decision.

Whereas, it has been the policy of the Internal Revenue Service since 1970 to deny the benefits of tax-exempt status and deductibility of contributions to racially discriminatory private schools.

Therefore be it resolved, It is the sense of the Congress that current Federal law clearly authorizes and requires the Internal Revenue Service to deny tax exempt status and deductibility of contributions to private schools that practice racial discrimination.

● Mr. HART. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I am submitting today, along with Senators Durenberger and Moynihan and 26 other cosponsors will put the Congress firmly on record against tax-exempt status for private schools that practice racial discrimination. The concurrent resolution states the sense of the Congress that current Federal law clearly authorizes and requires the Internal Revenue Service to deny tax-exempt status and deductability of contributions to private schools that discriminate on the basis of race.

The Reagan administration's confusing policy reversals of the last few weeks on this issue have been unfortunate and unnecessary. The administration has demonstrated an incredible insensitivity, not only to the law, but to the progress made on civil rights in this Nation over the last 20 years, and more important, to the fundamental values which have been the foundation for such progress. The new statute which President Reagan has now proposed only adds to the confusion and insensitivity.

Current Federal law is clear. As the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has pointed out, the Constitution, title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the Internal Revenue Code authorize, indeed require the IRS to deny tax-exempt status to private schools which discriminate on the basis of race.

The courts have already interpreted Federal law in this manner. In 1971 the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia stated in Green against Connally:

> The Internal Revenue Code provisions on charitable exemptions and deductions must be construed to avoid frustrations of Federal policy. Under the conditions of today they can no longer be construed so as to provide to private schools operated on a racially discriminatory premise the support of the exemptions and deductions which Federal tax law affords to charitable organizations and their sponsors.

The decision in Green has been affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Racial discrimination has no place in American society. The Federal Government has a moral obligation to use whatever sanctions are available to condemn it. The Federal Government already has the legal authority to insure that such discrimination is not financially subsidized through the tax code. The concurrent resolution we are introducing today reaffirms Congress recognition and strong support for the legal authority which already exists to fight such discrimination. I urge my colleagues to join in making this important statement by cosponsoring the concurrent resolution.●

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, we are submitting this concurrent resolution to emphasize our belief—as legislators—that the legislative policy Congress established in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 compels the denial of tax-exempt status to private schools that discriminate on the basis of race.

The issue here is one of privilege, not one of right. The Federal Government certainly cannot restrict the right of private or religious institutions to espouse whatever doctrines they choose. But a tax exemption is a privilege, not a right. It is fully proper for Government to condition access to that privilege on compliance with primary national policies, such as the policy of nondiscrimination. Tax-exempt status is often critical to the survival of private educational institutions, and this policy has traditionally been one of the Federal Government's most powerful levers to combat discrimination in education. As a Republican, I am proud of the fact that the policy was first initiated by a Republican administration.

I fully appreciate the President's concern that the IRS not act as an unelected legislature in determining national policy. Yet as I have analyzed past statutes and existing case law, I have become convinced that the legal basis for these denials comes not from IRS decisions, but from the legislative policy enacted by the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That act specifically states that:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia recognized the impact of that policy on the tax code when it held in Green against Connally that:

> The Internal Revenue Code provisions on charitable exemptions and deductions must be construed to avoid frustrations of Federal policy. Under the conditions of today they can no longer be construed so as to provide to private schools operated on a racially discriminatory premise the support of the exemptions and deductions which Federal tax law affords to charitable organizations and their sponsors.

The *Green* decision was later affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The point of this judicial and legislative history is simple: The IRS has not been establishing legislative policy. It has been implementing a policy established by the Congress and enforced by the courts for nearly two decades.

I recognize that implementation of any policy of this nature requires the Department of the Treasury to make difficult value judgments. But they are not dissimilar to the types of judgment the Department makes in other tax policy areas, and the Department has functioned ably under this requirement for more than a decade. No matter how carefully we restate or recodify that policy, IRS will still be forced to make similar value judgments as it applies the new language to varying fact situations. On balance, the difficulties encountered in enforcing such requirements are far outweighed by the negative impact of abandoning the enforcement effort.

I intend to listen with great care to the arguments raised on the administration's bill during Finance Committee hearings. But with this concurrent resolution, I want to make clear the fact that there can be no "hiatus" within which institutions practicing discrimination can qualify for tax-exempt status. And I want to emphasize the need to be absolutely certain that any legislation brought before the committee be at least as abroad as the protection provided under current law.

Racial attitudes are precisely what the term implies—attitudes. And Government is the ultimate reflection of the attitudes of society. Any retreat from the policies established in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would reflect the wrong attitude, and would send the wrong message to millions of Americans. I do not believe that either the Congress or the President would accept retreat.

I urge every one of my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this concurrent resolution, so there will be no doubt left in the public mind on where this body stands.●

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I find myself, for the first time since my election to the Senate, in the peculiar position of introducing legislation that was never necessary, should never have become necessary, and would not be necessary, were it not for the administration decision of January 8, to reverse a decade old Federal policy of denying tax-exempt status to private schools that discriminate on the basis of race. And while I welcomed the President's statement of January 12, that the granting of tax-exempt status to discriminatory private schools is contrary to national policy, it is clear that there are certain matters of law and public policy which by virtue of their importance to the country were settled long ago. And should remain settled. Such is clearly the case with respect to the national policy against racial discrimination in education.

May I say, Mr. President, that I feel a personal stake in this matter. I was counselor to the President in 1970 when the original decision was made by the Internal Revenue Service that schools with racially discriminatory policies could not qualify for tax-exempt status. Throughout the spring and early summer of that year I participated in a series of meetings leading up to the Treasury's decision. It was the right decision both as to policy and law and it should remain. It was upheld in the 1971 Federal court decision, Green against Conally, and was affirmed later that year by the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is my firm belief that the Internal Revenue Code as presently drafted bars the granting of tax-exempt status to racially discriminatory private schools. That policy accurately reflects the requirement that a private school, in order to meet the common law definition of a charity, must not operate in manner contrary to well-established national policy.

That the elimination of racial discrimination is a fundamental national goal is without question. It is clear now, as it was in 1970, that racial discrimination in education offends against the constitutional rights of citizens as declared in the Supreme Court's 1954 seminal decision Brown against Board of Education, and in numerous subsequent decisions. As public policy it is embodied in Federal statutes, perhaps the most notable being title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I deeply regret that the President has found it necessary to submit legislation to Congress to embody what, in my view, is already a matter well settled by not only the courts, but by Congress. It would be far better if the Internal Revenue Service were directed to continue to enforce the policy announced in 1970 to deny tax-exempt status to racially discriminatory private schools. I am also concerned that the recent actions by the administration have done a disservice and will perhaps be shown to have done serious harm to the whole of private education. Organizations such as the Council for American Private Education (CAPE), and the United States Catholic Conference, which together represent almost all of private elementary and secondary education have steadfastly opposed racial discrimination. Indeed, CAPE, which represents about 85 percent of private elementary and secondary education, has denounced the administration decisions to grant tax-exempt status to discriminatory private schools. Furthermore, for those of us in Congress who have long supported legislation designed to assure that students enrolled in nonpublic schools receive their fair share of the Federal resources devoted to education, the administration decision will have made our task more difficult.

Mr. President, this long-settled matter should remain settled. The Congress should go on record. And this concurrent resolution should be promptly agreed to.

I ask unanimous consent that CAPE's statement of January 11, 1982, be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CAPE Denounces Administration Reversal of Tax-Exemption for Private Schools

The Council for American Private Education, representing organisations which enroll nearly 85 percent of private school students, deeply regrets the Administration's decision to abandon the government's policy of denying tax-exempt status to private schools and other private institutions which practice racial discrimination. We find this a highly regressive step with serious implications for the future of private schools and of American education.

The member organisations of CAPE, the major denominational and secular school organizations in the country, have long opposed racial discrimination in private education. It is significant that the Packwood-Moynihan Tuition Tax Credit Bill, of deep current concern to private education, contains specific language prohibiting racial discrimination in schools. We are firmly of the mind that no school should be able to flout the law of the land and most particularly where human rights and dignity are at stake.

We will now work with Members of Congress in every possible way to legislatively redress this action and will take part, as appropriate, in relevant court actions toward the same end.●

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am proud to cosponsor this resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that current Federal law clearly authorizes and requires the Internal Revenue Service to deny tax exempt status to private schools that practice racial discrimination. As the resolution states, this conclusion has been affirmed by our Nation's highest court.

The administration's attempt to reverse national policy on this issue cannot hold up under the law. The following letter from the former Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Tax Division of the Justice Department and his special assistant, recently printed in the Washington Post, sums up the situation: It is not tax policy, it is the law, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1982]

It's Not Tax Policy, It's the Law

Until a year ago, we were responsible for establishing tax litigation policy of the United States and presenting to the federal courts the government's position with respect to federal tax exemptions for racially discriminatory schools. We find it difficult to reconcile the reasons this administration is giving for allowing tax-exemption benefits to such schools with the holdings of our courts. The career officers of Treasury and Justice who watched the development of the law on this point during the last decade must have been astounded to read the Treasury Department's pronouncement that "the language . . . and legislative history [of the pertinent statute] provide no support for" prohibition of tax exemptions to such schools. Since the three-judge U.S. District Court decision in *Green* v. *Connally* in 1971, which was subsequently affirmed by the Supreme Court, the federal appellate courts have held unanimously that the Internal Revenue Code forbids extension of tax-exemption benefits to racially discriminatory schools. This principle has been respected in at least the past three administrations, not as expedient policy conformable to current politics but as a rule of law to be obeyed. The U.S. Court of Appeals in Richmond, speaking through two three-judge panels last year, restated this principle, observing that allowing exemptions for segregated schools would "tear [the tax statutes] from their roots." As recently as October 1981, Justice Department attorneys filed a memorandum in the Supreme Court supporting these decisions.

The reported statement of White House spokesman David Gergen that the decision to allow tax exemptions for racially discriminatory schools was taken "on the unanimous recommendation of Justice and Treasury officials" is credible only if we are to understand the "officials" to be recent political appointees unfamiliar with the positions of their legal staffs and we submit, the clear voice of the law.

Our president's suggestion that this policy change was necessary to prevent the IRS from "govern[ing] by administrative fiat" seems disingenuous. The allowance of tax exemptons to racially discriminatory schools in violation of the congressional enactments as interpreted by the courts is itself a flagrant example of administrative fiat. Obeying the law is not, as the president implied, "exercising powers that the Constitution assigns to the Congress." It is, rather, the duty of every executive branch official.

M. Carr Ferguson.

New York.

Leonard J. Henzke, Jr.

Annandale.●

● Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, the Reagan administration has set civil rights back to the days of Plessy against Ferguson (1896)—when whites had the legal right to keep blacks separate and unequal. On January 8, the administration announced that the IRS would no longer deny tax exempt status to racially segregated schools. This raised the flag of racial discrimination and reversed 12 years of national policy.

It meant that the Government would grant exempt status; that is, indirect subsidies, to more than 100 private and religious schools that discriminate on the basis of race. The IRS would follow this new policy until the Congress forced it to stop.

At the same time, the Justice Department informed the Supreme Court that the Treasury Department no longer had any dispute with two schools whose claim to tax-exempt status was the subject to a pending case. In essence, the Justice Department asked the High Court to vacate the case as moot. This was a total turnaround. Last September, the Department had argued the exact opposite before the Supreme Court. At that time, they made the case against tax-exempt status for racially segregated schools based on the Government's commitment to the eradication of racial discrimination in education. They said it was manifested in the Constitution, in Federal statutes, and in national policy prohibiting public subsidy of racially discriminatory educational institutions.

The two schools are Bob Jones University in Greenville, S.C., and Goldsboro Christian Schools in Goldsboro, N.C. Both institutions have denied admission to blacks on religious grounds. Bob Jones University did open its doors to black students 10 years ago, but few attend. Those who do must conform to the university policy that states the interracial dating or marriage is forbidden by the Bible.

This announcement was hailed by fundamentalist religious schools, leaders of the religious right, and many conservative politicians. But it brought a barrage of criticism not only from the civil rights community, but from public officials of both parties. And it generated a groundswell of public protest.

On January 12, President Reagan faced reality. He announced that he would propose legislation to outlaw tax exemptions for segregated schools. Four days after opening the door to discrimination, he was forced to support legislation to close it.

The President's explanations have been flimsy. He said that this policy should be decided by Congress—not the IRS. He claimed that his goal all along was congressional action to bar tax exemption to schools that practice racial discrimination, so that "for the first time that will be the law of the land."

The facts are to the contrary. The Supreme Court and all Federal appeals courts that have considered the issue have ruled that Congress has already outlawed such tax exemptions for institutions that discriminate on the basis of race.

It was a dozen years ago that the IRS issued its regulation denying tax-exempt status to racially segregated schools. This action was upheld in the case of Green against Connally, and affirmed by the Supreme Court. This case, brought by black taxpayers and their children in Mississippi, was based on title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. In his decision, Judge Harold Leventhal wrote that the black children were "entitled to a declaration of relief on an enduring, permanent basis, not on a basis that could be withdrawn with a shift in the tides of administration, or changing perceptions of sound discretion."

Judge Leventhal anticipated that the issue might become controversial. He sought to head off confusion. He wrote:

> To obviate any possible confusion the court is not to be misunderstood as laying down a special rule for schools located in Mississippi. The underlying principle is broader, and is applicable to schools outside Mississippi.

But the President has turned a deaf ear to this and other similar decisions. He claims there is "no basis in the law" for what the IRS has done for 12 years under Democratic and Republican administrations. In fact, the IRS has been following the law as mandated by the Federal courts.

Now the administration has come up with legislation to forbid tax exemptions for segregated private schools. At the same time it grants exemptions to two institutions while congressional action on the proposed legislation is pending. This leaves the administration saying no to segregated private schools in principle, while saying yes to Bob Jones University and Goldsboro Christian Schools in practice. They are saying yes to segregation with our tax dollars—at least until Congress acts.

The President has taken a long-settled area of the law, reversed it by executive fiat, and then invited Congress to restore the status quo. If Congress passes legislation but does not make it retroactive to the 1970 IRS regulation, these two schools will receive an economic windfall. They will have been exempt from Federal income, social security, and unemployment taxes. Their donors will have deducted their payments on income tax forms as charitable contributions. This would be the most blatant form of government sponsorship of segregated academies. It would subsidize the color line drawn at the door of institutions that have discriminated on the basis of race since 1970.

Mr. President, the Government cannot promote racial discrimination in any form. It cannot be a silent partner in so many cases like that of Sayrine Cotten, a black Goldsboro police officer. She did not know about that the admissions policy at Goldsboro Christian when she brought in her young son, Charles, to register last summer. Rev. Donald Tice, chairman of the school's board of trustees and pastor of the sponsoring church, explained that the school did not admit blacks. Reverend Tice expressed his sympathy and the hope that she should understand. Mrs. Cotten did not understand. She said:

> I asked how they could call this a Christian school and be segregated. I was very hurt. I had never been so humiliated in my life.

It is time to stand against the humiliation of Americans like Sayrine Cotten. It is time that racially segregated private academies realize that they cannot operate contrary to established public policy on racial nondiscrimination at taxpayers' expense. It is time that the Reagan administration wake up and realize that the public will not tolerate a retreat on social justice.

President Reagan has tried to define this as a procedural issue—and he admits only to handling it clumsily. He protests that his administration supports equal justice, but I suggest that the gentlemen protests too much.

President Reagan has deemphasized civil rights generally and attacked affirmative action in particular. He has cut the budget of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. He wants to water down a 10-year extension of the Voting Rights Act already passed by the House. His record is all too clear.

Mr. President, current Federal law clearly authorizes and requires the IRS to deny tax-exempt status and deductibility of contributions to private schools that practiced racial discrimination. Therefore, I am please to be an original cosponsor of the concurrent resolution which underscores this. To pursue legislation at this time would make a mockery of the Congress and the Federal judiciary. This is no time to reopen a question that has been settled long ago.●

● Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to consponsor this concurrent resolution to reaffirm the law and policy denying Federal tax exemptions for private schools that discriminate on the basis of race.

I am astounded that this reaffirmation has been made necessary by the Reagan administration's decision to disregard 18 years of law and an 11-year history of judicial opinions. Congress made its abhorrence of any Government support for segregation clear when it enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Since that time it has been the law of the land that tax exemptions must be withheld from private schools that practice racial discrimination.

In 1971, the courts upheld the Congress position when the U.S. district court for the District of Columbia in Green against Connolly ruled that the Internal Revenue Code granting charitable exemptions and deductions must not frustrate Federal policy. The court specifically ordered such exemptions be denied to private schools that discriminate on the basis of race. That order was subsequently affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court. Two U.S. appellate courts have followed the Green decision. The Internal Revenue Service, under Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter, consistently enforced that policy as they are required to do so.

I do not believe the American people question the wisdom of this policy. It is dictated by the Constitution, by fundamental fairness, and by America's longstanding commitment to racial equality. Any other policy is unacceptable.

Yet the Reagan administration has unjustifiably challenged both the status of the law and the validity of the policy. On January 8, 1982, the Treasury Department announced that the IRS would grant tax exemptions to two private schools that exclude students on the basis of their race. This surprising announcement ignited a wave of protest that the administration's action was an explicit endorsement of racial discrimination. In the wake of strong, widespread public objection to this decision, the administration said its new policy should not be construed to sanction segregation. They believe they have uncovered an inadequacy in the existing law which was overlooked by three other Presidents, their Attorneys General, and a host of Federal judges, including the Supreme Court of the United States. To remedy this alleged inadequacy, the President has proposed new legislation giving the IRS express authority to deny tax-exempt status to private schools with racially discriminatory practices.

This new legislation is both unnecessary and confusing. The law and policy against granting tax exemptions to such schools are clear. Accordingly, the President should instead direct the IRS to exercise the ample authority it already has under the Constitution, the Civil Rights Act, and the Internal Revenue Code to deny tax exemptions to private schools that discriminate on the basis of race. And the IRS should continue to enforce existing law. That is the intent of this concurrent resolution.●

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution being submitted today. The concurrent resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that:

> Current Federal law clearly authorizes and requires the Internal Revenue Service to deny tax-exempt status and deductibility of contributions to private schools that practice racial discrimination.

The occasion for submitting this concurrent resolution is President Reagan's reversal of the decade-long IRS policy of denying tax-exempt status to private schools that racially discriminate. Shortly after this reversal, I and a number of other Senators circulated a "Dear Colleague" letter in which we urged Senators to cosponsor legislation which we intended to introduce to continue the IRS policy of denying such exemptions. We also sent a letter to President Reagan urging him to insist that the IRS continue its policy of denying tax-exempt status to these schools until Congress could act.

We are submitting this concurrent resolution instead of legislation for several reasons. First, civil rights groups, including the Civil Rights Commission, are adamantly opposed to the introduction of any legislation concerning the tax-exempt status for private schools. As they correctly point out, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides the legislative authority for denying tax exemptions to private schools that racially discriminate. Moreover, introducing legislation would establish a bad precedent: It is unnecessary to enact specific legislation to cover every conceivable form of racial discrimination.

Second, it may be difficult to pass legislation without restrictive or weakening amendments being added. The Ashbrook and Dornan amendments which restrict IRS tax-exempt enforcement authority illustrate this danger. The concurrent resolution, while avoiding the dangers inherent in the legislative process, will allow Congress to clearly express its strong support for the longstanding IRS policy which is based on current law.

Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks, I would like to address the deplorable way in which the administration handled the tax-exempt issue.

Succinctly, I think the question of the IRS making "social policy" is a red herring. This precise issue was resolved in 1971 by the three-judge district court in Green against Connally. The decision was subsequently affirmed by the Supreme Court. Since 1971 the IRS policy has been to deny tax-exempt status to private schools that racially discriminate.

There is a far more plausible explanation for the President's reversal of IRS tax-exempt policy. It was a concession to supporters of Bob Jones University, Goldsboro Christian Schools, and other private and religious schools that have been denied tax-exempt status. It cannot be denied that while the President flip-flopped on the tax-exemption policy, these two schools were able to obtain their long-denied tax-exempt status despite the fact that their cases were pending before the Supreme Court. Moreover, it appears that legislation which is being proposed by the administration would not deprive the two schools of their tax-exempt status.

This explanation appears even more plausible in light of the insensitivity of this administration toward blacks who, not so incidentally, stood to lose the most by the President's initial reversal of IRS policy. Examples of this insensitivity include the administration's budget cuts, which have hit blacks the hardest, and the administration's lack of support for the version of the Voting Rights Bill which passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support.

To conclude, I hope that the concurrent resolution being submitted today will help to favorably resolve the tax-exempt issue. I also hope that the matter will serve to make the adminstration more sensitive to the rights of our black and minority citizens in the future.●

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have joined many of my colleagues here today in cosponsoring this concurrent resolution. This seems to me to be an appropriate means of assuring that the longtime practice of the Internal Revenue Service, denying tax-exempt status to private schools with racially discriminatory policies, is reinstated quickly, and that any doubts as to the authority of the IRS to do so are laid to rest.

As the concurrent resolution clearly states, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 not only provides the authority for denying tax-exempt status to schools with racially discriminatory policies, but requires such a denial. Senator HART, by utilizing the vehicle of a concurrent resolution, has given us the opportunity to ratify the actions of the courts in liberally construing the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act. It is my hope that, in doing so, we may avoid future misunderstandings of congressional intent which serve only to arouse, unnecessarily in my views, the concerns of many of our citizens over the breadth of Congress commitment to civil rights.

I have received several letters from constituents who oppose the IRS practice on the grounds that it is an invasion of first amendment rights, that is, freedom of religion. I disagree. The denial of tax-exempt status does not in any way interfere with or prohibit the free exercise of religion. The schools which are affected by this policy may still practice their racially discriminatory policies, abhorrent as they may be to others, but if they choose to continue those policies, the Federal Government will not subsidize them.

I want to thank Senator HART for submitting this concurrent resolution so that we in the Senate can restate the intent of Congress in title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 expeditiously and unequivocally.●

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 60—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING PROPOSED FTC USED CAR RULE

Mr. PRESSLER submitted the following concurrent resolution which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. CON. RES. 60

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress disapproves the final rule promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission dealing with the matter of the trade regulation rule relating to the sale of used motor vehicles, which final rule was submitted to the Congress on January 28, 1982.

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise to submit a concurrent resolution of disapproval to the Federal Trade Commission's proposed rule pertaining to the sale of used motor vehicles which was submitted to Congress today.

This proposed rule is identical to the proposed rule which was submitted to Congress last session by the FTC, and my resolution of disapproval is identical to Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, which I introduced in response thereto with 45 cosponsors last September.

The basis for this disapproval concurrent resolution, or legislative veto, is the FTC Improvements Act of 1980 which requires that every trade regulation rule promulgated by the FTC must be submitted to Congress for legislative review before becoming effective.

The statute further specifies that the Congress must act to disapprove such proposals, within 90 legislative days—but should the session end before the 90 days have passed, the proposed rule becomes inoperative.

Although Senate Concurrent Resolution 33 was reported favorably by the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee on December 10 by a vote of 12 to 4, the Congress adjourned last session prior to the end of the 90-day period without taking action on the resolution of disapproval. Although the statute does not require the resubmission of a disapproval concurrent resolution in Congress, and while I believe it can reasonably be maintained that Senate Concurrent Resolution 33 is still operative, I am submitting the current disapproval resolution to insure that there is no question that the Senate has the opportunity to readily address this issue.

There is evidence of considerable opposition to the proposed rule in both Houses of Congress, with over 200 cosponsors in the House of Representatives last year. The FTC, however, has chosen to resubmit the proposal based upon their interpretation that the 1980 statute requires resubmission in the current session.

With the resubmission of the proposed rule at the beginning of this session, the Congress will have ample time—90 legislative days—to dispose of this issue.

Mr. President, I wish to make the point clear that I do not oppose the regulation of the used car market. The consumer should be protected in areas of safety and serviceability. However, the present FTC proposal is poorly drafted and overly broad in scope.

Hearings held last year in the Senate brought forth testimony illustrating the severe ambiguities of the proposal. On one hand it was pointed out that the regulation would cost millions of man-hours in paperwork and millions of dollars in additional mechanics' wages in complying with the inspection of the 52 mandated items in the automotive system, costs which would be borne by the consumer. On the other hand, it was argued, the forms the FTC requires to be filled out by auto dealers would give the public the false illusion of an ironclad warranty. Persuasive arguments were made that dealers could hide behind the FTC required document. Few doubted that the $10,000 penalty imposed by the rule would result in adding much litigation to the Federal court.

Forty-five colleagues of mine in the Senate agreed that the used car forms were sufficiently flawed to join me in cosponsoring my concurrent resolution to disapprove this FTC regulation. This effort is the first exercise of the two-House veto established by the Congress in 1980.

It is clear that Congress must delegate authority to regulatory agencies. The number and complexity of issues with which Congress must deal requires this. In recent years, however, regulatory agencies have inadvertently become a fourth branch of the Government over which no one is exercising effective control. Because of the increasing frustration of Americans with burdensome redtape and regulations, Congress has recently begun to seriously reexamine and reduce the authority it delegates to agencies. Thus in 1980, when Congress reauthorized the FTC, it provided for a means to override its proposed rules.

It should be noted that in the past several years, the Congress has, on several occasions, specifically warned the FTC against intruding into the area of used car warranties. Thus, the ambiguous regulations issued in September set the stage for last fall's congressional confrontation with the FTC.

Many of the cosponsors of the disapproval resolution do not, in fact, entirely oppose some regulations of the used car market. The consumer should be protected in the areas of safety and serviceability. However, as I have noted, the present FTC proposal is ambiguous and overly broad in scope. It should be understood that this proposed rule has three parts. The first two, which are reasonable, provide for:

A prohibition against misrepresentation on the part of the dealer for any known defects; and

The requirement that the dealer make clear any details regarding warranties, or if no warranty is being offered to so state.

The third portion of the rule, however, would require the merchant to affirmatively inform the buyer of suspected, but undetermined, defects in 52 prescribed areas. However, the rule also consistently states that the dealer is not required to inspect the car. Thus, a merchant is placed in the position of speculating on what defects there might be. In order to be safe, a dealer would have to give a complete examination to the entire automobile—a costly procedure. Such ambiguity should not be added to the Federal regulations.

I believe there is a consensus that holds that dealers should not be permitted to misrepresent the quality of the automobile sold and that it is reasonable to require that a dealer fully disclose the term of his warranty and his responsibility to provide repairs.

These items are, however, a far step below requiring dealers to look for defects which they do not know about. To impose such a requirement is a drastic departure from current practices.

To those who question about safety defects, it should be noted that present law, as adopted by all States, provides recourse. Under the provisions of the Uniform Commercial Code, the buyer is protected under the principle of implied warranty—that any items bought from a merchant are good for ordinary use. Thus, the storied unsuspecting little old lady has recourse if the wheel falls off her car. This the type of defect that the dealer should have known about before the sale. Under the terms of such an implied warranty doctrine, most dealers—if they wish to stay in business without lawsuits—will look for the safety hazards and obvious serviceability defects.

Thus, many of the problems which this proposed rule seeks to address already have remedies. Indeed, many States have their individual inspection laws. Because of the $10,000 fine involved in the proposed regulations, it would appear that dealers—to be safe—would thoroughly examine automobiles whether or not they suspected defects in any of the 52 required areas.

The cost of such inspections, estimated to be about $150 per vehicle, will, of course, be passed on to the consumer. Additionally, great cost will be borne by the Government in hiring personnel in the FTC to screen claimants from individuals around the country and to prosecute their cases if meritorious.

In 1980, both major political parties pledged to curtail Federal regulation. The FTC's ruling will be a costly burden upon business with questionable benefits for the consumer. Congress has acted responsibly in reviewing the Commission's work in this case. Elected officials should exercise their duty as watchdogs over the unelected bureaucracies. We must not hide behind a delegation of authority. Therefore, I would urge the speedy consideration of the concurrent resolution at hand.●

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE REPORTING DATE OF THE STUDY GROUP ON THE COMMEMORATION OF THE U.S. SENATE BICENTENARY

Mr. BAKER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 285

Resolved, That section 5 of S. Res. 381 of the 96th Congress, as agreed to by the United States Senate on August 1, 1980, is amended by striking out "not later than eighteen months after the date of agreement to this resolution" and inserting in lieu thereof "not later than December 31, 1982".

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. McCLURE, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 286

Resolved, That in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,132,840, of which amount (1) not to exceed $10,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Chairman of the committee, except that voucher shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 287—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 287

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,267,000, of which amount (1) not to exceed $30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $3,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of such Act).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 288—AN ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. PACKWOOD, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 288

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions, under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $3,171,746, of which amount (1) not to exceed $20,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $8,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of such Act).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 289—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 289

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $1,273,800, of which amount not to exceed $15,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 290—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF SENATE ELECTION LAW GUIDEBOOK AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MATHIAS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. Res. 290

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 96-45, entitled "Senate Election Law Guidebook", be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed eight hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 291—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DOLE, from the Committee on Finance, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 291

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Finance is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,143,000, of which amount not to exceed $30,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 292—AN ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 292

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accoprdance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorised by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1982, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $3,785,310, of which (1) not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of such Act).

Sec. 3. The Committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 293—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 293

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorised by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,685,961 of which amount not to exceed $50,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 294—AN ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER, from the Committee on Small Business, reported the following original resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 294

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule SSVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Small Business is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $902,000

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 295—RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 295

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing

Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 23, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $2,439,912 of which amount not to exceed $18,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 296—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ROTH, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, reported the following original resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 296

Resolved, That, in carrying out its powers, duties, and functions under the Standing Rules of the Senate, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of such rules, including holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by paragraphs 1 and 8 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Governmental Affairs is authorized from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $4,672,526, of which amount (1) not to exceed $68,725.32 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(i) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended), and (2) not to exceed $1,500 may be expended for the training of the professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of such Act).

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to study or investigate—

(1) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corruption, or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public.

(2) the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities;

(3) syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in futherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce of the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities;

(4) all other aspects of crime and lawlessness within the United States which have an impact upon or affect the national health, welfare, and safety; including but not limited to investment fraud schemes, commodity and security fraud, computer fraud and the use of off-shore banking facilities to carry out criminal objectives.

(5) riots, violent disturbances of the peace, vandalism, civil and criminal disorder, insurrection, the commission of crimes in connection therewith, the immediate and longstanding causes, the extent and effects of such occurrences and crimes, and measures necessary for their immediate and long-range prevention and for the preservation of law and order and to insure domestic tranquillity within the United States.

(6) the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to—

(A) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(B) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents;

(C) the adequacy of present intergovernmental relationships between the United States and international organizations principally concerned with national security of which the United States is a member; and

(D) legislative and other proposals to improve these methods, processes, and relationships;

(7) the efficiency, economy, and effectiveness of all agencies and departments of the Government involved in the control and management of enrgy shortages including, but limited to, their performance with respect to—

(A) the collection and dissemination of accurate statistics on fuel demand and supply;

(B) the implementation of effective energy conservation measures;

(C) the pricing of energy in all forms,

(D) coordination of energy programs with State and local government;

(E) control of export of scarce fuels;

(F) the management of tax, import, pricing, and other policies affecting energy supplies;

(G) maintenance of the independent sector of the petroleum industry as a strong competitive force;

(H) the allocation of fuels in short supply by public and private entities;

(I) the management of energy supplies owned or controlled by the Government;

(J) relations with other oil producing and consuming countries;

(K) the monitoring of compliance by governments, corporations, or individuals with the laws and regulations governing the allocation, conservation, or pricing of energy supplies; and

(L) research into the discovery and development of alternative energy supplies; and

(8) the efficiency and economy of all branches and functions of government with particular reference to the operations and management of Federal regulatory policies and programs:

Provided, That, in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee or any subcommittee thereof shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of any particular branch of the Government; but may extend to the records and activities of any persons, corporation, or other entity.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall affect or impair the exercise of any other standing committee of the Senate of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended.

(c) For the purpose of this section the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, or its chairman, or any other member of the committee or subcommittee designated by the chairman, from March 1, 1982, through February 28, 1983, is authorized, in its, his, or their discretion (1) to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and production of correspondence, books, papers, and documents, (2) to hold hearings, (3) to sit and act at any time or place during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate, (4) to administer oaths, and (5) to take testimony, either orally or by sworn statement, or, in the case of staff members of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations specifically authorized by the chairman, by deposition.

(d) All subpenas, contempt proceedings, and related legal processes of the committee and its subcommittees authorized under S. Res. 361 of the Ninety-sixth Congress, second session, and S. Res. 57 of the Ninety-seventh Congress, first session, including the subpena enforcement and contempt proceedings against William Cammisano, are authorized to continue.

Sec. 4. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 28, 1983.

Sec. 5. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, except that vouchers shall not be required for the disbursement of salaries of employees paid at an annual rate.

SENATE RESOLUTION 297—RESOLUTION RELATING TO A USURY CEILING

Mr. BAUCUS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

S. Res. 297

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System should impose a national usury ceiling of 10 per centum per annum.

USURY CEILINGS

● **Mr. BAUCUS.** Mr. President, high interest rates and inflation have become a great cause of fear, anxiety, and apprehension to all of us in our outlook on the economy, America's business futures, and our own personal lives.

Daily we read of another bankrupt company in an already beleaguered industry, a troubled thrift that finally went under after months of struggling; small business, one after another, giving up the toehold they worked so hard to establish, finally losing the battle and shutting their doors forever.

Our deficit skyrockets, inflation hovers at an unconscionable rate, and the stock market declines. The once thriving housing and auto industries have suffered greatly.

We need not look for the answer. The answer is high interest rates.

Mr. President, interest rates must be brought down. And they must be brought down now. We cannot allow this terrible trend to continue.

It is for this reason, and with the heartfelt hope that at last in such a long while, high interest rates will be brought down to stay. I feel one concrete way of insuring this is to place a usury ceiling on the Federal Reserve Board.

I hope my colleagues will join me in agreeing that it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Federal Reserve Board should adopt a 10-percent annum usury ceiling.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter relating to this subject, and my reply be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Park County
Democratic Central Committee,
Livingston, Mont.

Senator Max Baucus,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Max: On October 28, 1981, a resolution was passed, stating, "That a 10% Federal Reserve usury law should be adopted."

Please support or introduce a bill to accomplish this.

Sincerely,

Robert Schleicher,
Chairman.

—

December 19, 1981.

Robert Schleicher,
Livingston, Mont.

Dear Robert: I want to assure you that I am deeply concerned by the effect of high interest rates upon individuals as well as industries. With inflation so high and interest rates hovering in the double digits, I believe we must be successful in our attempts to control inflation so that interest rates will come down. There is some indication that they may come down at least in the short term, illustrated in part by the Federal Reserve Board dropping their prime rate from 14 to 12 percent within the last two months.

I voted for the President's economic package with the hope that it will achieve those objectives, although I do realize it will take some time and it does have many risks associated with it. I've also co-sponsored legislation which urged the Federal Reserve Board to take more account of the economy in determining the money supply.

In addition, I agree that we must continue to seek ways to lower interest rates and think your resolution should receive full consideration in the Senate. Therefore, I am taking the liberty of preparing legislation along the lines you have suggested and will submit it with the hope that it will receive prompt attention.

Thank you again for your letter. I will keep you informed on this as the situation develops. In the meantime, I hope you will stay in touch.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

—— ——.●

SENATE RESOLUTION 298—RESOLUTION HONORING MARTIN L. SKUTNIK FOR HIS COURAGEOUS BEHAVIOR IN THE AIRCRAFT DISASTER IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. Domenici) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 298

Whereas, the tragic crash of a passenger jet into the Potomac River on January 13, 1982, caused the death of seventy-eight persons;

Whereas, the Nation's attention and sense of loss were focused on this shocking catastrophe;

Whereas, Martin L. Skutnik, an employee of the Congressional Budget Office, risked his life by diving into the river to save a drowning woman from certain death; and

Whereas, his selfless valor and heroism in the face of extreme danger reflect the most noble of human qualities and instill in his family, associates, Federal employees, and the Nation as a whole a feeling of great pride and gratitude: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Senate honors and commends Martin L. Skutnik for his lifesaving act of heroism.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Martin L. Skutnik.

SENATE RESOLUTION 299—DESIGNATING "INTERNATIONAL FRANCHISE DAY"

Mr. WEICKER submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 299

Whereas, the franchise method of marketing has made significant contributions to the American economy and has successfully allowed hundreds of thousands of small business persons to participate in marketing networks offering quality product and service distribution;

Whereas, franchising today accounts for nearly one-third of all U.S. retail sales, spans more than forty industries, and directly employs some 4.6 million people;

Whereas, franchised businesses currently enjoy a success rate better than 95 percent;

Whereas, people of all classes and backgrounds have been provided economic opportunities in starting their own businesses through the training and management programs offered in franchising;

Whereas, franchising permits the small business person to compete with large chains which are increasingly dominating our economic landscape;

Whereas, legitimate, established franchises fully support and adhere to uniform disclosure laws to assure that prospective franchise buyers are fully aware of their rights and obligations before investing in a franchise; and

Whereas, franchising continues to expand internationally, effectively serving ever greater number of people the world over: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is requested to issue a proclamation designating May 4, 1982, as "International Franchise Day," and calling upon the people of the United States and those who have been served by franchising throughout the free world to celebrate such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

● **Mr. WEICKER.** Mr. President, today I am introducing a resolution to declare May 4, 1982, as International Franchise Day.

Franchising represents a significant force within the small business community and, indeed, accounts for nearly one-third of all retail sales in the United States today. Franchised sales of goods and services will reach $377 billion by the end of 1981 and franchising directly employs some 4.6 million people. The majority of business format franchise companies are small, many with fewer than 50 units. It is a way of doing business for 40 industries and assists small business in competing on an equal footing with big business.

Individuals who enter into franchising are by and large the small business entrepreneur whose desire is to own his own business. And with the help of his franchise partners he overwhelmingly succeeds and stays in business. The U.S. Department of Commerce has reported each year since 1971 that more than 95 percent of franchiseeowned outlets have remained in business. The International Franchise Association, a nonprofit trade association of franchise companies, now in its 23d year, recently surveyed its 350 members and found that fewer than 1 percent of the franchised outlets of respondent companies had closed as a result of business failure.

Franchising also means opportunities in business for minorities. In 1979, minority-owned business format franchised outlets increased in number by 5 percent. Managerial training programs, expertise in running a business, and the willingness of many franchisors to help their franchisees obtain loans has assisted persons without substantial prior business experience to join corporate America.

Franchising has similarly enabled women to advance their skills and widen their horizons. In fields ranging from accounting to automotive services to restaurant management, women are proving their value and competence to work outside the home and on their own in their own businesses.

Franchising has also helped to improve the U.S. balance of trade. Department of Commerce statistics show that the growth rate of foreign units now exceeds that of domestic expansion. The trend toward overseas expansion is illustrated by the activities of a number of the member companies of the International Franchise Association, 42 percent of which have reported that they already franchise internationally. The clear indication is that more are planning to do so in the near future.

The concrete benefits of franchising to the businessman, to the consumer, and to the country are clear. But the success of franchising means even more than this. It affirms that an entrepreneurial spirit and American know-how are strongly enough engrained in the fabric of this country that we cannot surmount the economic challenges currently facing us.

Mr. President, the time has come to recognize the benefits of franchising. Accordingly, it is to this end that I, along with my good friend, distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the Senate Small Business Committee, Mr. NUNN, have introduced this resolution to request the President to designate May 4, 1982, as "International Franchise Day" to honor the significant contribution of franchising to the American economy.●

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Government Procurement will conduct a hearing on the "Impact of the Davis-Bacon Threshold on Small Business Construction Contractors," on February 2, 1982, in room 424 of the Russell Senate Office Building at 9:30 a.m. For further information, please contact Kim Elliott at 244-3840 or Bret Bernhardt at 224-6012.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADVOCACY AND THE FUTURE OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee's Subcommittee on Advocacy and the Future of Small Business will conduct a hearing on "S. 1947, a Bill to Improve Contract Notices in the Commerce Business Daily," on February 17, 1982, at 9:30 a.m., in the Federal Building, San Diego, Calif. For further information, please contact Grace Hussie at 224-3841 or Kim Elliott at 224-3840.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee will conduct an oversight hearing on timber set-aside program, on February 19, 1982, at 9 a.m. in the Federal building, Hot Springs, Ark. For further information, please contact Kim Elliott at 224-3840 or Alan Chvotkin at 224-8497.

Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Small Business Committee will conduct a hearing on influencing small business investment in enterprise zones, on February 23, 1982, at 9:30 a.m., in room 424 of the Russell Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Bob Wilson at 224-5175.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND DEBT MANAGEMENT

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, the Subcommitee on Taxation and Debt Management of the Senate Finance Committee held a hearing today at 9 a.m. One bill has been scheduled for the hearing: S. 1887, introduced by Senator DANFORTH relating to the installation of airbags in automobiles.

The purpose of this notice is to briefly explain the issue raised by this bill. This may help in charting the progress of tax legislation before the Taxation Subcommittee, and to assure greater public awareness of tax bills coming up for hearings.

TAX CREDIT FOR INSTALLATION OF SAFETY AIRBAGS IN NEW AUTOMOBILES AND EXCISE TAX ON SALE OF NEW AUTOMOBILES WITHOUT SAFETY AIRBAGS—S. 1887

PRESENT LAW

No income tax credit is currently allowed for the manufacture of an automobile on which an automatic safety airbag has been installed, nor is a manufacturer's excise tax imposed on the sale of an automobile because it has not been equipped with an automatic safety airbag.

PROVISIONS OF S. 1887

S. 1887 has two provisions:

First, it will allow manufacturers to claim a $300 refundable income tax credit for domestic automobiles produced in 1984 and thereafter on which an automatic safety airbag has been installed by the manufacturers.

Second, the bill would impose a $300 manufacturer's excise tax on the sale or first lease of an automobile by a manufacturer if a qualified automatic safety airbag has not been installed. This provision would also apply to the sale of automobiles for the 1984 model year and thereafter.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE ROOSEVELT LEGACY

● **Mr. DOLE.** Mr. President, hundreds of thousands of words will be spoken this week to commemorate Franklin Roosevelt's Centenary. Thousands of memories will fill not only the Halls of Congress, but the hearts of those old enough to remember F. D. R. the man, and leader of men. No one who was alive in March of 1933 is likely to forget Roosevelt's bold proclamation that fear itself was the Nation's greatest enemy. No one who heard his voice then or subsequently, will forget the challenge of those bleak times, or the personal magic with which a crippled man in pince-nez and battered fedora epitomized the battles against hunger, unemployment, heartlessness and a foreign scourge called nazism.

He said in his inaugural:

> We now realize as we have never realized before our interdependence on each other; that we cannot merely take but we must give as well; that if we are to move forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline . . . This I propose to offer.

HOPE FOR THE HOPELESS

Whatever criticism has since been lodged against the subsequent growth of Government in America—criticism which I, among others, have leveled from time to time—it cannot detract from the magnitude of Roosevelt's achievements, or obscure the danger to capitalistic democracy that hung over the Capitol Plaza on that long ago March morning, like an expectant vulture. F. D. R. promised "action, and action now." He lived up to his promise. But it was not only what he did that gave hope to the hopeless. It was how he did it.

There was a moral center to the Roosevelt revolution, an inclusive embrace of millions of Americans previously ignored by their Government. People cared about F. D. R. because he so evidently cared about them. They found inspiration in his words, and recognition in his actions. I will leave it to the historians to render the ultimate verdict on the New Deal. But I know that in many hearts this week, there is a pang of nostalgia, and a hunger for that common discipline Roosevelt called for and put to such historic use for 12 tumultuous years.

COMPETENCE WITH COMPASSION

Now, we are in the midst of a new political revolution. The pendulum has swung away from a government that had become a bloated parody of

F. D. R.'s instrument of compassion. Now, we are calling upon the American people to launch a still newer deal, a renaissance powered by their own ingenuity, guided by their own traditional belief in self-rule. We are retrieving government before it slips away from the governed.

We will practice competence as well as compassion. We will raise the floor under the disadvantaged—without lowering the ceiling on everyone else. We will rebuild America, so that inflation does not rob the poor, and Government does not pick the pocket of a struggling middle class.

The monuments to Franklin Roosevelt are secure. The elderly will continue to receive their social security checks. The unemployed will continue to benefit from unemployment insurance. Rural homes will not surrender electricity, nor will our minority citizens ever again be relegated to privation and neglect.

The United States will remain in the front rank of nations, where Roosevelt led her, and we will pursue with imagination as well as realism his dream of a world where peace is not a synonym for weakness, nor war an inevitable excuse for imperialist visions of glory.

THE LEGACY OF A LEADER

All this is safe, as is Roosevelt's place in the hearts and minds of his countrymen. A few days before his death, President Roosevelt was working on a speech he would never deliver, a speech looking forward to the end of the war and the start of a difficult peacetime transition. In it, he asked his fellow Americans to hold tight to their confidence. "The only limit to our realization of tomorrow," he wrote, "will be our doubts of today."

To the very end, he recognized the primary function of modern leadership: To set the agenda and shape the psychology of a nation.

On this historic anniversary, when we celebrate the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt, we could do his memory no higher honor than to renew and refresh that call to faith. For now as then, great challenges are our portion, and we shall move forward only with strong and active faith. Let that faith be Franklin Roosevelt's living legacy, as well as his permanent epitaph.●

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT'S BIRTH

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, F. D. R.—the magic associated with that name is as strong today as it was when Franklin Roosevelt occupied the Oval Office 40 years ago. His popular appeal has survived the test of time, and the enthusiasm with which millions of people gather to celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of his birth is testimony to the lasting impact of his leadership.

Politicians and historians will debate the merits of the New Deal policies for as long as history is written. But however one judges Franklin Roosevelt's policies, there can be no dispute about the quality of the man or the leadership he gave this country. F. D. R. was a man who cared deeply about the people he represented.

That commitment shone in his words and deeds, and it was the sheer quality of his leadership as much as any other factor that maintained America's belief in its own potential through a devasting recession and a destructive world war.

He rallied our spirit with his courage, and his unshakeable faith in the perserverance of the human spirit. He taught that the handicaps we faced as a Nation were no more insurmountable than the personal handicaps he had overcome in his life.

Death prevented F. D. R. from seeing the fulfillment of his dream—a Nation with peace abroad and prosperity at home. But the qualities with which America pursued those goals are testimony to the qualities of the man who led us through 13 of the darkest years in our history.

F. D. R. left every American a legacy of leadership. He taught us that when we stand together, we are a human force that can overcome any challenge. The economic challenges this Nation faces today call for similar qualities, and an equal degree of dedication. How we respond to this challenge will be the ultimate test of how true we are to the legacy of F. D. R.—a part of American history for a full century today.●

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

● Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, we are observing today the centennial of a man who more than any other in living memory shaped this Nation's life.

Franklin D. Roosevelt came to office at a time when this country was what he described as "A stricken Nation in the midst of a stricken world."

F. D. R. took power in an America that had for too long been dominated by what he called "that definition of liberty under which for many years a free people were being gradually regimented into the service of the privileged few."

Franklin Roosevelt was the inheritor of disastrous, rigidly ideological economic policies pursued by two previous administrations. And when those policies led the Nation to depression in 1929, their architect, Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon, had this advice.

"Liquidate labor," he said.

"Liquidate stocks, liquidate the farmer, liquidate real estate."

Today, economists argue in abstract terms over what caused the Great Depression. But the realities of those times were not abstract at all.

There was hunger—widespread hunger—in the world's richest agricultural country. And while millions were going hungry, farmers by the thousands were losing their land.

"I remember vividly," Carl Rowan wrote recently of his childhood in Tennessee, "going with my grandmother to shell pecans at pay of 3-cents per pound for the shelled meats (plus all the pieces of pecan we could eat surreptitiously I remember that when my father wasn't working, which was often, we would take to the fields knowing that either we shot a rabbit or there would be lean pickings for dinner."

But, Mr. Rowan wrote, "What I remember most is not the hard and hungry days, but the hopelessness that permeated everything."

Hope was the first of Franklin Roosevelt's gifts to the people of this country—hope not for miracles or quick fixes. Rather, the hope that F. D. R. provided was based on the conviction of the American people that someone truly cared for them—and that their Government truly was trying to lead the country to a better day for all.

It is hard to overestimate the importance of that perception.

F. D. R.'s leadership kept alive the faith of our people in our democratic institutions. Other countries were not so lucky.

By providing to the American people what is now called the "social safety net," F. D. R.'s reforms strengthened and preserved the free enterprise system.

And by opening the door, by taking into the system those who had been left out, F. D. R. began a sweeping process of positive change in this country that has yet to run its course.

Under Roosevelt, minorities of all kinds—racial, religious, and in the case of the South, even regional, began their move away from second-class citizenship.

Working men and women secured the right to organize.

Bank depositors knew that never again could their assets disappear overnight.

Farmers were at last given a stable market for their produce.

Investors received a degree of protection from fraud and manipulation in the market.

For the elderly, the unemployed—for those who had always been the most vulnerable—F. D. R. established the principle that America would be a principled and compassionate Nation.

"What incredible good fortune," wrote Joseph Alsop recently, "That Franklin Roosevelt was a man who loved the right and loathed the darkness and was guided always by a deep, old-fashioned patriotism and a rather simple, old-fashioned Christian faith. As Americans, we take such good fortune for granted, for we have been lucky in our Presidents in all our major crises as a Nation. But can we forever count on such good fortune in the future? I often wonder."

I wonder, too. But the fact remains, Mr. President, that F. D. R. was there when this Nation so desperately needed him.

And he demonstrated in depression and war one of this Nation's greatest strengths—that its diverse people can and will come together and sacrifice for the common good. All they ask is what F. D. R. gave to them—the knowledge that the burden is fairly and equitably shared by all. As long as we remember and act upon that principle, we'll be building on the day-to-day life of the Nation the best and most appropriate memorial to Franklin D. Roosevelt.●

THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

● **Mr. WEICKER.** Mr. President, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the Presidential oath on March 4, 1933, 12 million men were out of work. 5,000 banks had closed their doors. A quarter of the Nation's farmers had lost their land. National income had been cut in half. A third of the people were, in the words that would be used, "ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed." It was one of the Nation's darkest and most desperate hours.

Piercing the darkness of the time, the new President, in a bold confident voice, said:

> This great nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper.

His jaw jutted out as defiantly as his words.

> So first of all, let me assert my belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.

In his first 100 days in office, he instituted sweeping financial, business, agricultural, and industrial reforms. His vigorous agenda of social legislation included the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the National Recovery Act, the Emergency Banking Act, and other emergency measures designed to restore confidence and get the country on the road to recovery.

Roosevelt had been elected on a program to reduce the Federal budget, but he was not a man to hold ideology above reason.

> It is commonsense—

He said,

> To take a method and try it. If it fails, admit it frankly and try another, but try something.

When the acts of 1933 began to fail in their objectives, Roosevelt, undaunted, instituted more reforms in 1935—the Works Progress Administration, the National Labor Relations Act and the Social Security Act. Two years later, came the U.S. Housing Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. Roosevelt's doggedness and willingness to try everything stirred the Nation, gave them confidence in themselves and their Government. Here was a President who believed above all that America was destined to succeed, and though the going would be tough, the American people were going to arrive at that "rendevous with destiny."

Mr. President, the New Deal dramatically changed the relationship of the Government to the people. The collapse of the free-enterprise system forced the Government into an active role in order to preserve that system. As his guiding principle, F. D. R. believed that the future of American democracy depended on the strength of the people. To save the system. The Government had to concern itself with the health and welfare of its citizens. His methods were not fascist, as some have ignorantly interpreted history. The Government of the United States does not run the people, it is the people. Roosevelt moved the country toward this new era of democracy and a time when reckless self-interest would no longer be allowed to interfere with the public good.

Roosevelt's democracy encompassed all people, not just the landed and the wealthy. He made everyone feel that they were a part of the American experience.

> These unhappy times call for the building of plans—

He said,

> that build from the bottom up and not from the top down, that put their faith once more in the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid.

Later, when the Nation had an urgent need for good men, those once-forgotten men were among the first to volunteer.

The columnist Walter Lippman wrote:

> Leaders are the custodians of a nation's ideals, of the beliefs it cherishes, of its permanent hopes, of the faith which makes a nation out of a mere aggregation of individuals.

Roosevelt was such a leader. He represented for the people a spirit of optimism, generosity, and decency as vast as the land itself.

A man of limited vision or energy might have ignored the rumblings across the sea as he struggled to repair the problems at home. But Roosevelt, whose leadership was not limited to Americans and national borders, knew that the future of humanity hinged on America's willingness to play an active role in an always turbulent world. Faced with strong isolationist feelings at home, Roosevelt, nonetheless, worked to assist the Allied cause. When the rumblings in Europe exploded into war, the United States, "the great arsenal of democracy," was prepared.

All across the globe, the voice of Roosevelt was carried on the airways. Like a father to his flock, he encouraged the friends of freedom, reassured the fearful and the faint. The free world saw America as its one hope, a strong and courageous nation, ready to stand for freedom's cause. "But westward, look, the land is bright," Winston Churchill, quoting the poet Clough, told his embattled England.

In the waning days of the war, when the Allied armies in Europe were crossing the Rhine and pushing on to Berlin, and in the Pacific, planting the flag on Iwo Jima hill, pictures taken of the Commander in Chief showed an old man, the burden of his Presidency etched in lines on his grey, haggard face. Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, when the war was not yet won. But the country he left behind was strong. Indeed, it was the foremost power on the globe, with a future as bright and promising as any ever faced in the history of mankind.

William Shakespeare described three types of great men: those who are born great, those who achieve greatness, and those who have greatness thrust upon them. In Roosevelt's case, while he was born into a great family, there was little reason to believe in the early years of his life that he would achieve anything beyond the gentlemanly distinction that wealth affords a man. In 1921, however, he contacted polio and was forced to spend much of the next several years in a determined battle to regain his strength. Unwilling to retire from the public eye, Roosevelt drew on hidden reserves of strength and was elected Governor of New York before running for the Presidency. Seldom in history has a leader had to face crises as grave as those that confronted President Roosevelt—a Great Depression and a World War. Fortunately, Roosevelt was not a quitter. Lyndon Johnson said of him:

> He was the only person I ever knew—anywhere—who was never afraid. God, how he could take it for all of us.

Roosevelt arrived at the helm in a dark time. People cried out desperately for greatness, and Roosevelt, taking the challenge, sought it for them. The key to Roosevelt's greatness was not the success or failure of his reforms, but the unbending vision of hope he offered the people when all they had had was despair.

Mr. President, there has been much historical controversy over whether or not it was the New Deal or the war that brought America out of the depression. Scholars are generally in agreement, however, in the belief that the actions Franklin Roosevelt took between 1933 and 1939 enabled the free enterprise system and democracy to survive. He kept the world from being turned inside out.

In the years following Roosevelt's death, the New Deal gave way to more reforms, the New Frontier and the Great Society. Our standard of living increased dramatically. We built houses, provided education, cured diseases, made great strides in the war against poverty, and we reached the Moon.

Now in 1982, we are facing another serious economic crisis. The cause being identified is not recklessness in the private sector, but reckless spending by the Government. The New Deal and its legacy of programs have been assailed. Clearly, there are numerous instances where these programs were failures, where they were overblown beyond need and where they became frought with waste and corruption. Clearly, we have needed to cut back drastically on spending. But on this day, on the 100th anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt's birthday, let us pause from our haste to balance the budget and take a minute to remember the advances of the past, the victories won. The welfare of the people was, is, and always will be the legitimate concern of the Federal Government. In the modern world we live in, this country cannot afford to have our Government retreat to the sidelines. Above all—to the poor, the elderly, the handicapped, and all the people who are now confronted with the despair of being forgotten—we must offer hope, precious hope. We must never abandon our commitment to be humane and decent.

Mr. President, just before Roosevelt died, he was working on a speech he was to deliver on Jefferson Day. The final lines read:

> The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today.

Roosevelt picked up his pen and wrote:

> Let us move forward with strong and active faith.●

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

● Mr. **MATHIAS.** Mr. President, participating in the joint meeting of Congress to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt has a very special meaning for members of my generation.

Franklin Roosevelt was a great many different things to a great many different people. But to members of my generation he was first, last, and always, our Commander in Chief.

I feel a great many emotions speaking of him here today. But more than anything else, I feel awe that a "deck ape" from the U.S.S. *Appalachian* should be paying tribute to his Commander in Chief from the floor of the U.S. Senate. On December 7, 1942, when I enlisted in the U.S. Navy, that idea would have been inconceivable.

Because of that special relationship forged in the crucible of World War II, I am especially proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I pay tribute to him as a great leader, who sustained our Nation and its people through some of the darkest passages in their history. I pay tribute to him as a great President, whose qualities of mind and heart moved him always to keep his eye on the sparrow. I pay tribute to a gallant human being, who, despite pain and handicap, is remembered for his smile, for his ebullience, for his spirit. And I salute him as a magnificent Commander in Chief.

The Congress now has before it a proposal to authorize construction of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be located in West Potomac Park here in Washington. I can think of no more fitting way to mark this bicentennial year than by providing the funds for this memorial. I urge my colleagues to support it.

But Franklin Roosevelt has left this country a legacy that transcends any memorial we could devise for him. He has left us his vision of a just society.

In these difficult economic times, as we set about the business of trying to cut costs and spur economic recovery, let us keep in mind the essential ingredients of that vision. We could have no better plumbline as we seek to reconstruct our democratic society on a firm economic base.

Looking toward a bright postwar America which he did not live to see, Roosevelt declared:

> We cannot be content, no matter how high the general standard of living may be, if some fraction of our people—whether it be one-third, or one-fifth or one-tenth—is ill-fed, ill-clothed and insecure.

He urged the country forward to "new goals of human happiness and well-being" to be equally shared "regardless of station, race, or creed." And he announced an economic bill of rights which included:

The right to a useful and remunerative job;

The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

The right of every family to a decent home;

The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment; and

The right to a good education.

If we measure what we do here in this 2d session of the 97th Congress against those goals, the American people will be well served.●

SUGAR PROGRAM—FARM BILL 1981

● Mr. **INOUYE.** Mr. President, during the last session, the Congress was finally persuaded of the critical need for a sugar program, and approved a modest sugar provision as part of the 1981 farm bill. Inclusion of this provision was achieved only after a most difficult struggle.

Mr. President, as you will recall, on September 18, 1981, the Senate approved as part of the farm bill a sugar program prescribing a loan rate of 18 cents per pound beginning on October 1, 1982, with a half cent per year mandatory increase for the life of the program. The Senate had earlier overwhelmingly rejected amendments to eliminate the sugar provison and to reduce the loan rate to 16.5 cents. The House on October 15, 1981, approved on a vote of 213 to 190 an amendment which deleted the sugar provision from the farm bill, after having earlier voted to substitute an 18 cents per pound loan provision for the 19.6 cents per pound provision originally contained in the bill. The conference committee, after having earlier voted 15 to 1 to retain the Senate-passed 18 cents per pound loan provision and then lowering the loan rate to 17.5 cents per pound, reached a final agreement on December 8 to reduce the loan rate for 1982 to 17 cents. The conference committee established loan rates of 17.50, 17.75, and 18 cents per pound for 1983, 1984, and 1985, respectively. The conference report received final approval by the Senate on December 10 and by the House on December 16. The farm bill was signed into law by the President on December 22.

Those of us who devoted a great deal of time and effort working for an adequate sugar program were not entirely pleased with the sugar provision which emerged from conference. I am consoled, however, by the fact that we were finally able to get a sugar program included in the farm bill. In view of the fact that the House traditionally has strongly opposed sugar legislation, getting a sugar provision in the bill was a significant achievement, and was an important first step in providing vitally needed support to our ailing domestic sugar industry. Now that a sugar program has been enacted, it is my hope that the Congress will see fit to make reasonable and badly needed upward adjustments to the loan rates.

During the floor debate on the sugar provision, I indicated that I was deeply disturbed that many of the misconceptions and inaccuracies which had characterized the debate on the sugar program had continued to persist, and I expressed my hope that these misconceptions would be dispelled as the facts regarding the sugar program were brought to light. The great difficulty with which the sugar provision was finally shepherded through the Congress, even in spite of the fact that the program, if properly administered, would have no adverse budgetary impact, demonstrated to me that the facts concerning the sugar program were never fully and accurately understood, and that misconceptions still prevailed.

Misconceptions still prevail. An editorial which appeared in the December 24, 1981, edition of the Wall Street Journal sharply attacked the newly enacted sugar program in a less than accurate or complete analysis. In the interest of presenting a more balanced view of the sugar program, I wish to share with my colleagues a copy of an editorial which appeared in the December 28, 1981, edition of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in response to the Wall Street Journal editorial. As noted in the Star-Bulletin editorial, too often only one side of the sugar story is told by the national media.

Mr. President, the Star-Bulletin editorial's observation that the recently enacted sugar program will not operate to enshrine inefficiency deserves particular emphasis. The loan rates established in the farm bill are substantially below the current average cost of production of even the most efficient domestic sugar producers. Contrary to the implication in the Wall Street Journal editorial that U.S. farmers produce sugar less efficiently than anyone except the European Economic Community, U.S. sugar producers are among the most efficient in the world. In the State of Hawaii, sugar growers produce the highest average yield of sugar per acre in the world, and produce sugar using the lowest number of man-hours per unit of output than anywhere else in the world.

Also in the interest of promoting a more balanced and accurate assessment of the sugar program, I wish to share with my colleagues two reports prepared by Dr. Thomas K. Hitch, a prominent and highly respected economist in the State of Hawaii.

The first report, entitled "Sugar," was prepared for Presidential Counselor Edwin Meese upon his recent visit to Hawaii. The report analyzes the importance of sugar to the Nation, and cogently demonstrates the need for a rational and coherent sugar policy. A few of Dr. Hitch's observations are particularly notable. Sugar prices in the American market have flunctuated wildly since 1974, the year the 1934 Sugar Act expired and the United States last had an affirmative sugar policy. Consumers have not benefited from this unhindered operation of "free market" forces because consumers were probably hurt more by high prices in the years of world shortages of sugar than they were benefited by low prices which prevailed in years when the sugar market was depressed. Further, when prices of products which use sugar as a factor of production rise because of high sugar prices, those prices generally do not fall with the lowering of sugar prices.

Of the total world production of sugar, 82 percent has a guaranteed buyer at a guaranteed price, according to Dr. Hitch. The "world sugar market," on which the United States depends for much of its sugar, represents only 18 percent of the world's production. This is a market, Dr. Hitch states, "wherein periods of world sugar shortage the buyer pays exorbitant prices and wherein periods of world sugar surplus all homeless sugar is dumped."

Dr. Hitch predicts that:

> If the U.S. does not adopt a constructive sugar policy it will ultimately lose its domestic sugar industry—which will be a considerable economic loss since among the agricultural products sugar ranks tenth in terms of acreage, fifth in terms of tonnage, and sixth or seventh in terms of dollars to the farmer.

He then emphasizes a point that has not been understood by opponents of the sugar program:

> The U.S. sugar industry will not be killed by cheap foreign sugar that is produced more efficiently than ours: it will be killed by foreign sugar that is dumped into our market at either a loss to the producer or at a profit that is provided by subsidies from the government of origin.

The second report by Dr. Hitch, entitled "How the Collapse of the Sugar Industry Would Impact on Hawaii's Economy," assesses the importance of the sugar industry to the economy and people of Hawaii, and concludes that the demise of Hawaii's sugar industry would have a devastating impact on the State. The sugar industry in Hawaii employs approximately 9,100 persons, and it is estimated by Dr. Hitch that for every full time employee in the sugar industry, there are 2.29 persons employed outside the sugar industry whose jobs would not exist were it not for the sugar industry. Thus, almost 30,000 jobs in Hawaii, nearly 8 percent of total civilian employment, are attributable directly or indirectly to the sugar industry. Every $1 of income to the sugar industry in Hawaii generates $1.15 of personal income to Hawaii residents. If the Hawaiian sugar industry were to collapse, statewide unemployment would rise by 8 percent to over 13 percent, more than twice the present rate. The unemployment rate on the islands of Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, where sugar is the prime economic activity, would be far higher than the statewide rate, and the economies of those islands would collapse.

History has shown that the land in Hawaii used to grow sugar cannot feasibly be converted to another agricultural crop. Consequently, the demise of the local sugar industry would cause irreparable damage in terms of loss of jobs, income, and agricultural land use.

Mr. President, I ask that the Star-Bulletin editorial and the two reports by Dr. Hitch be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my hope that this will serve to further responsible discussion of U.S. sugar policy.

The material follows:

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE SUGAR STORY

We notice on the editorial page of the Dec. 24 Wall Street Journal a very sharp attack on the new sugar price support program.

Staff-written, it makes points like these:

Apart from the European Common Market, U.S. farmers raise sugar more expensively than anyone else.

Many of the U.S. beet and cane producers have operations so small and plants so ancient they can't be efficient. It would be better if they were forced to switch to other crops like potatoes, corn and wheat.

Pushing up the U.S. price and freezing out lower-cost foreign suppliers is promoting anti-American sentiment in some countries. The Dominican Republic, dependent on sugar for 60 percent of its foreign exchange, may swing to an anti-American candidate in its 1982 elections.

Sugar isn't an essential commodity. The U.S. can get along with only those producers efficient enough to turn out sugar regardless of government aid.

These arguments have a compelling ring to them. But there is another side to the picture. And we are disappointed at how seldom it surfaces in the national media.

The so-called world market that the Wall Street Journal refers to is really a dumping ground. More than 80 percent of the sugar raised in the world is sold in protected markets. Less than 20 percent gets into the world market. That is why this market gyrates so sharply. Because of relatively small surpluses, the world future price now is down around 13 cents a pound. But just a few years ago it had roared up over 30.

For the U.S. to do what other nations do and protect its farmers against the most extreme buffeting of the world market is not necessarily bad policy.

The 17-18 cent a pound support price in the new farm legislation for the next four years will not enshrine inefficiency. It is far below the U.S. production cost of 25 cents a pound reported by the government, also below the Hawaii production cost of 20 cents a pound.

As the Journal pointed out in an earlier article, the price of sugar does not, as critics allege, reflect directly in the price of soft drinks, candies, pastries and other products using lots of sugar. These prices went up recently as sugar prices went down. Sugar prices are being unduly singled out as an inflation factor.

Only half the sugar the U.S. consumes is now raised in the U.S. Even with the farm act, that percentage will decline. There will be room for more foreign sugar to enter the U.S. than ever before. It is hardly desirable for us to become entirely dependent on foreign sources for a basic food.

In Hawaii's case, there is an additional strong reason for wanting sugar to survive. It is far stronger here than nationally. Despite many studies, no other crops have proved out as substitutes for sugar here—not potatoes, corn, wheat or anything else except on a small scale far below the acreage in sugar.

The sugar industry won a razor-thin victory in the passage of the farm bill. The Wall Street Journal talks of legislative efforts to undo it as early as next year.

It will behoove the sugar industry to mount an educational campaign right now. It should see that articles like the one mentioned here are responded to in factual fashion.

Too often, it seems to us, the national media are telling only one side of the sugar story.

SUGAR

The United States has not had an affirmative sugar policy since 1974 when the 1934 Sugar Act expired. Our sugar policy from 1934 to 1974 (forty years) was to have sugar prices stabilized in the American market by assigning marketing quotas, based on U.S. requirements, to domestic and foreign producers so that prices found a level that would be fair to both the American consumer and the American sugar producer.

Since 1974—with no sugar policy—the price of raw sugar in the American market has been on a roller coaster—as high as 65 cents in 1974, as low as 9 cents in 1976, as high as 44 cents in 1980 and now at about 16 cents.

The U.S. beet and cane sugar producers cannot remain in business on a permanent basis with this kind of wildly fluctuating price level—with two of the last eight years being boom years ('74 and '80), one being barely profitable (1975), and the other five being deeply depressed years with tremendous losses.

Even during these years the American consumer has not benefited, because while there have been more years of cheap sugar than of dear sugar, the price of sugar in the years when there was a world sugar shortage rose to such astronomical heights that it probably hurt the consumer more in those years than he was helped in the cheap years. Also, when very high sugar prices push the price of candies, ice cream, soft drinks, and baked goods up they tend to stay up after the price of sugar falls so that the American consumer to a certain extent lives with high sweetening prices even when sugar becomes cheap again.

To understand the world sugar market, one has to realize that some 80 percent of the sugar produced in the world has a guaranteed home at a guaranteed price; that prices in these countries do not fluctuate up and down with world under- and over-production; and that the so-called "world price" for sugar is set by demand and supply forces that affect only that 18 percent of the world's sugar production that is uncommitted—and therefore very cheap when world production is surplus and very dear when world production is short.

To put it another way, all the major sugar exporting countries of the world have a government guaranteed set price for sugar consumed in that country with the price set at a level that will make it profitable to grow sugar in such large quantities that it is a major export item. This is true for Cuba, Brazil, Australia, Philippines, South Africa, Argentina, India, Mexico, and the EEC as well as the rest of the smaller sugar exporting countries. Take the EEC. Through its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) European growers are not only guaranteed 27 cents a pound, but are encouraged to produce excess sugar for export, and in the last decade the EEC has become a major exporter of subsidized sugar in contrast to having traditionally been a net importer of sugar. European sugar is now being sold in large quantities in the U.S. market when the price for raws is about 15 cents after paying shipping and insurance, while the price in Europe is 27 cents.

This situation is demonstrated by the fact that when the "world sugar market" price skyrocketed from about 10 cents a pound in 1973 to 65 cents a pound in 1974, there was no change in the domestic price of refined sugar in the countries that produced 60 percent of the world's export sugar and only a modest change upward in the other exporting countries—while the price in the U.S. more than doubled. The same thing happens when "world" sugar prices fall.

Furthermore, most of the world's sugar importing countries are buffered against fluctuations in this small but highly volatile world market—buffered generally by long-term agreements with sugar exporting countries to provide them with a normal supply at a normal price. This is shown by the fact that in that same period of rapid price rise (1973-1974) the countries that consumed 22 percent of all world sugar imports had no change in the domestic price of sugar, those accounting for 12 percent of world imports only a 1-15 percent rise, and with only a handful of countries (with the U.S. being far and away the major one) suffering from the full inflation of prices.

The so-called world sugar market, being only a small fraction of world sugar production, is a market where in periods of world sugar shortage the buyer pays exorbitant prices and where in periods of world surplus all homeless sugar is dumped. If the U.S. does not adopt a constructive sugar policy it will ultimately lose its domestic sugar industry—which will be a considerable economic loss since among agricultural products sugar ranks tenth in terms of acreage, fifth in terms of tonnage, and sixth or seventh in terms of dollars to the farmer.

The U.S. sugar industry will not be killed by cheap foreign sugar that is produced more efficiently than ours: it will be killed by foreign sugar that is dumped into our market at either a loss to the producer or at a profit that is provided by subsidies from the government of origin. U.S. sugar production is probably among the most efficient in the world—just like our production of wheat, corn, rice, soya beans, and many other agricultural products. But it cannot live on a 12 cents, or 15 cents, or even 17 cents per pound price—a price which incidentally is about the same as good top soil at your corner garden shop. In short, if the U.S. were to require that foreign sugar not be allowed to be should in the American market at a lesser price than it is sold for in the country of origin, the U.S. sugar industry would be profitable and have a long and successful life.

Furthermore, if we lost our domestic sugar industry, the nation and its consumers would have to live with the roller coaster of the "world" sugar market, and could even find itself facing an OPEC-like foreign sugar cartel since the top thirteen sugar exporting nations ship about 80 percent of the sugar entering world trade—numbers much like those in the oil cartel.

Finally, if the U.S. lost its domestic sugar industry it would face catastrophe in the event of war or major shipping interruptions. Let us remember that in such times, sugar has always been about the first commodity to be rationed; that Napoleon developed the beet sugar industry when the British blockade stopped the flow of essential foreign sugar to Europe; and that all the countries of the world that protect their domestic sugar industries do so primarily because of these strategic considerations.

Let's get an affirmative U.S. sugar policy before it is too late.

THOMAS K. HITCH,
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, RESEARCH
Division, First Hawaiian Bank.

ENCLOSURE

1. THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF SUGAR TO THE HAWAIIAN ECONOMY

Hawaii has a comparatively high standard of living, with per capita personal income in 1980 being $10,101, 6 percent above the national average of $9,521. For that year, there were only 12 states out of the other 49 that had a higher per capita personal income than Hawaii.

The primary reason why Hawaii has been able to achieve her high level of living is that she has been able to develop a large number of export activities (some very large, some still small) which bring outside income into the state and enable her residents to purchase in large amounts those necessities and luxuries which constitute our high standard of living. Were we an independent nation we would be known as a wealthy trading nation—like Japan—rather than a poor non-trading nation—like Western Samoa or the Trust Territory of the Pacific.

In the quarter of a century since World War II, our four prime export activities have been the two prime "invisible" exports of sales to the federal government, primarily to the defense agencies, and sales to overseas persons (visitors) who come to Hawaii as tourists; and the two prime "visible" or commodity exports of sugar and pineapple. Last year, we had 3.9 million visitors come to Hawaii. We had 61,000 uniformed military personnel stationed in Hawaii, who in turn had 64,000 civilian dependents living with them here. We produced one million tons of raw sugar, about 18 percent of all sugar produced in the United States. And we canned 6.9 million cases of pineapple (plus 6.4 million of pineapple juice)—which represents over 17 percent of all the commerical pineapple produced in the world. In addition to these four pillars of the Hawaiian economy, we have a very large number of small export activities which, in total bring a significant volume of outside income into the state to augment our income from the big four. They include visible exports such as tropical fruits (papaya), tropical nuts (macadamia), flowers and foliage, garments, etc. They also include invisible exports such as sales of 15 million telephone calls from overseas people calling Hawaii, sales of vast amounts of advertising space to overseas firms advertising in Hawaii, the fueling and servicing of vast numbers of airplanes and ships, etc.

It follows that the activities which comprise the export sectors of the economy are of vastly greater strategic importance than the activities that comprise the purely domestic economy—the farmers who grow food for local consumption, the construction workers who build our homes and buildings, the retail merchants who handle the distribution of our goods, the employees in service establishments who attend to our personal needs, etc. Important as these activities are, they are replaceable—if the truck farmer fails, someone will take his place, just as would happen if a retail shop went out of business or a law firm folded. But if the Army closed down Schofield Barracks, or Del Monte abandoned its pineapple operations, or the market for tourists declined to the point that Sheraton closed its hotels, or—to get the point of this paper—if one or more sugar companies closed, that would be a complete loss to the economy that would almost by definition not be replaceable. And the loss would be, as we shall see in detail in the succeeding papers, felt not just in the industry that is hit, but to a greater or lesser extent depending on many circumstances, throughout the entire economy.

(1) The employment multiplier in sugar

Conclusion

Our analysis shows that for every employee working full time in the sugar industry, there are about 2.29 other persons in jobs outside of the sugar industry whose jobs would not exist were it not for the sugar industry. In other words, to arrive at a figure for total jobs in Hawaii created by the sugar industry, we take the number of direct employees and increase it by 229 percent. For every sugar job, there are 2.29 nonsugar jobs indirectly created by the sugar industry.

Analysis

Let us think of three levels of jobs created by the sugar industry in Hawaii. Let us label them (1) direct, (2) first-round indirect, and (3) multiplier indirect.

(1) Direct jobs are in the sugar industry: people on the payroll of the sugar plantation companies.

(2) First-round indirect. In addition, whenever any of the sugar companies purchase a service (construction, transportation, communications, government, legal, etc.) there are some people in the construction industry, transportation industry, communications industry, in government, in legal offices, etc., who are, indirectly, working for the sugar company and who thereby owe their jobs to the sugar industry.

(3) Multiplier indirect. When the people in categories 1 and 2 above get their wages

and salaries, they buy the goods and services that constitute their standard of living, and the people who supply these goods and services in turn spend their income and create further jobs down the line, etc., etc. There are therefore in this third category large numbers of people who owe a part of their job to the existence of the sugar industry although their job would have no direct (or even preceivable indirect) relation to a sugar plantation company. Example: When Joe Blow who works for Waialua Sugar Company takes the wife and kids to Sea Life Park and spends $15 on the outing, he is contributing, in a small way, to the support of a part of several jobs at Sea Life Park. Example: When the Sea Life Park employee goes to Foodland to do his marketing, his purchases help create a tiny portion of the jobs at Foodland.

We can, based on the detailed studies of the Research Division of First Hawaiian Bank, quantify these three levels of jobs.

Level 1: Of all the money disbursed by sugar plantation companies, 35 percent goes directly for payrolls and direct creation of jobs.

Level 2: Of the other 65 percent of the money spent by sugar plantation companies on their operations (including dividends, taxes, purchase of goods and services, etc.) about half becomes income to residents of Hawaii, or 32 percent of the total disbursements of the sugar plantation companies, with the remaining 33 percent representing "leakages" out of the state—income to non-Hawaii residents (in the form of federal taxes, goods and services purchased outside the state, dividends and interest paid to non-Hawaii residents, etc.) This means that there are almost as many indirect jobs (91 percent) created by the sugar companies as direct jobs.

Level 3: First Hawaiian Bank studies of the Hawaii regional multiplier show that for every dollar in personal income introduced into the economy, the spending and successive respending of it creates another 72 cents of income. This adds 72/100ths of a job to the economy for every job created directly (through payrolls) or indirectly (in the purchase of goods and services) by the sugar plantation companies.

This means that for every job at level 1, there is 91/100ths of a job created at level 2. For every job created at levels 1 and 2, there is 72/100ths of a job created at level 3.

Summary:

Level 1 (direct sugar job)	1.00
Level 2 (indirect sugar job)	0.91
Subtotal	1.91
Level 3 (multiplier effect)	x 1.72
	3.29

This means that there are 2.29 jobs in Hawaii created indirectly and through the multiplier effect for every job created directly by the sugar industry.

The jobs at what we have called level 2 and level 3 would probably be somewhat less for any one of the Neighbor Islands than they would be for the state as a whole. The reason for this is that Oahu is the geographic location of such a large part of the economic activity of the state that demand originating on, say, Kauai might be fulfilled by jobs on Oahu (e.g., in wholesaling, fertilizer manufacture, etc.)

But since the bulk of the sugar industry is concentrated on the Neighbor Islands (82 percent of sugar jobs are there), the overall multiplier is a fairly accurate representation of the job impact on the Neighbor Islands. Although adjustments in the multiplier might be made for individual islands, we are confident that the 2.29 multiplier for the state as a whole is well within the ball park, and may even be understated.[1]

Result

There are 9,100 employees in the sugar industry in Hawaii. With 2.29 nonsugar jobs dependent upon the sugar industry, there are some 29,900 jobs in Hawaii that depend on the sugar industry for their existence.

With total civilian employment of 385,000, the 29,900 jobs in Hawaii created by the sugar industry represent nearly 8 percent of total civilian employment.

(2) The income multiplier in sugar

Detailed studies by First Hawaiian Bank show that for every $1 of income of the sugar industry in Hawaii, 67 cents becomes personal income in the hands of residents of Hawaii. With a regional multiplier of 1.72, each new 67 cents added to the income stream of Hawaii from sugar exports generates a total of $1.15. Thus, each dollar of sugar income generates $1.15 of personal income in Hawaii. In a year when sugar income amounts to, for example, $300 million, the personal income in the state that is attributable to the sugar industry amounts to about $345 million.

Sugar income has fluctuated wildly in recent years—amounting to $685 million in 1974, dropping to $227 million in 1977, rebounding to $594 million last year, and falling to a projected $400 million this year—and consequently the portion that the sugar industry has contributed to total personal income in the state has varied from year to year. This latter figure (personal income in Hawaii attributable to the sugar industry as a percent of total personal income) was 9.9 percent in 1960, 10 percent in 1965, 15.6 percent in 1974, 3.7 percent in 1977, and 7.0 percent last year. In a normal year the sugar industry is responsible for the generation of approximately 8 percent of the income of Hawaii.

II. IMPACT OF THE DEMISE OF THE SUGAR INDUSTRY ON THE HAWAIIAN ECONOMY

With sugar representing approximately 8 percent of total civilian employment and 8 percent of total personal income in Hawaii, the demise of the industry would wreak havoc on the economy.

Were the Hawaiian sugar industry to collapse and were nothing else to occur to mitigate the damage we could expect the following results:

Employment would drop by 8 percent.

Unemployment, now at 23,000 (5.6 percent rate) would more than double to 53,000 (13 percent rate).

General fund tax revenues would decline by 10 percent—since for every 1 percent change in personal income there is a 1.25 percent change in general fund tax revenues.

Hawaii would clearly become a disaster area if employment were to drop by 8 percent, unemployment were to double to a rate of 13 percent, and State general fund tax revenues were to suffer a double-digit percentage decline. There would be no way under these circumstances that Hawaii could cope with its welfare load or maintain anything like the essential services required by its citizens.

State welfare costs have more than doubled in the last five years, and are running now at $250 million a year. If even half of those supported by the sugar industry were forced to go on welfare, the State's costs would increase at least 17 percent, to nearly $300 million. This would represent almost 17 percent of the total State budget.

It should be added that while a sudden collapse of the sugar industry would be disastrous to the State's economy, it would be even more devastating to several of the islands in the State in which sugar is the prime economic activity. For example, over 96 percent of Kauai's crop land is in sugar and applying the above analysis to the island of Kauai we find that a collapse of the sugar industry would raise unemployment on that island to 20 percent. Similarly, the island of Hawaii has over 82 percent of its crop land in sugar, and collapse there would raise unemployment to 16 percent. The situation is not too different on Maui which has over 47,000 acres in sugar. Collapse of the sugar industry there would raise unemployment to 14 percent of the labor force.

The conclusion is that the closing of the sugar industry would be devastating to the State's economy and would result in the almost complete collapse of the neighbor island economies.

While it is possible that some sugar-producing areas in the United State might be able to convert to other agricultural crops, such is demonstrably not the case in Hawaii and hence the loss of income, jobs, and land use would be permanent here. Studies, experiments, and history all combine to indicate that most if not all land now in sugar would not find remunerative agricultural uses if sugar ceased being grown. Ever since 1851 studies have been made and experiments conducted on agricultural alternatives to sugar, but the successes have been small because the problems are enormous. Hawaiian agriculture is hampered by shipping and marketing problems due to our isolated location, natural problems ranging from bugs and birds to winds and heavy rains, and money problems like the cost of importing machinery and fertilizer and the high cost of labor here. Agricultural production for our own needs is limited because Hawaii is a pocket market and local farmers cannot economically compete with large-scale Mainland growers. (Even if we were to achieve agricultural self-sufficiency in crops—at whatever high cost—it would require less than 3,500 additional acres of land to replace imports with vegetables and fruits that can be grown in Hawaii.[2]

The prospect of 217.7 thousand acres pulled out of sugar cultivation is therefore alarming, from the land use standpoint alone. When single marginal plantations of a few thousand acres have closed down from time to time in the past, the general result has been land reverting to scrub and the area sunk in poverty. Some examples:

1. Waimanalo Sugar Co. on Oahu ceased operations in 1947, taking about 3,300 acres out of sugarcane. Today, after 30 years, there are some dairy and poultry operations and small truck farms there, but Waimanalo is still a depressed area, with a high incidence of unemployment, welfare cases, and crime.

2. When Kilauea Sugar Co. on Kauai closed in November 1971, its parent company, C. Brewer & Co., faced the problem of what to do with 12,000 acres. Part of it was leased to Metcalf Farms for a feed grain op-

---

[1] In at least one sense the employment multiplier computed here for the local sugar industry might be considered an understatement. In our calculation of the number of jobs created indirectly (level 2) we assumed that it took the same number of dollars in personal income to create the level 2 job (indirect employment) as it took to create the level 1 job (direct sugar employment). Actually, the average of earnings in 1980 for sugar workers was $16,544 while for the entirety of business in Hawaii, it was $13,548. If adjustment is made for this factor, the total impact of a single direct job in the industry would increase from 3.29 to 3.63.

[2] Overall Economic Development Program, Hawaii State Department of Planning and Economic Development, 1976.

eration, but Metcalf later failed and went into bankruptcy. Brewer planned to sell some of the land in three-acre parcels for "ranchettes," but County officials rejected the plan, insisting that it would result in semi-ubranization on land designated agricultural. The company therefore sold the land in 25 large parcels, which were purchased by Mainland speculators who hoped the zoning would be changed to resort or urban. Both State and County officials have remained firm about keeping the land in agriculture. A few small farmers and one large rancher have been using about a third of the land, on six-month leases from the Mainland owners (leases too short to allow for capital investment or planning) but the remainder has lain idle. Many of the land buyers defaulted on their mortgages, and Brewer took back about 2,000 acres of land, on some of which it started a 100-acre prawn farm that failed and a 600-acre guava orchard that is doing well. Perhaps in future decades, with good promotion and marketing, guava might become a major industry for Hawaii—but it will take a long time and an immense amount of capital.

3. Kahuku Plantation Co. on Oahu closed in December 1971, taking about 3,000 acres out of sugar. Some employees were absorbed by the nearby hotel-resort development which was begun shortly after the plantation closed; a small tourist-oriented shopping center was opened in the renovated sugar mill; some small agricultural enterprises have raised sudax grass, tomatoes, corn and watermelons; and aquaculture ponds for prawns, shrimp, and oysters (some strictly experimental) occupy 345 acres. But the Kahuku community remains poor, and most of the sugar lands are lying idle.

4. Kohala Sugar Co. on the island of Hawaii announced in 1971 that it would close after the 1973 harvest; the date was postponed and it ceased operations in October 1975, taking 4,295 acres out of sugar. After the original announcement the State of Hawaii organized the Kohala Task Force to find substitute economic activities that would employ the 500 displaced sugar workers, and poured $6.2 million into funding new enterprises for the Kohala area. The largest of these, a feed grain and feedlot operation, went into receivership with debts of $4 million; it was finally purchased by a partnership which is operating the feedlot with a couple of employees but has abandoned the attempt to raise feed grain. A plastics firm also failed, was taken over by a new owner, and failed again. A hay-growing enterprise was foreclosed and has been transferred by court order to the same partnership that bought the feedlot. Two of the State-funded companies, both plant nurseries, are still operating and are paying back their loans. Altogether the State effort created only about 50 jobs in the Kohala area.

The dismal record shows that it is very difficult to find a replacement for sugar growing. Cattle ranching, which occupies so many of our total acres, is simply too unprofitable today to expand to sugar land. Pineapple is now just about holding its own, with several plantations closed down and only three companies remaining of the ten that were growing pineapple twenty years ago. Papaya and macadamia acreages can be expected to increase in the years to come, but after decades of great expansion they will occupy only 17 thousand acres.●

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC RECOVERY

● **Mr. LAXALT.** Mr. President, as we start the second year of the Reagan administration, we will continue to see the effects and pursue the goals of the President's program for economic recovery. The President's economic policies are a dramatic break with the past, an attempt to turn around 50 years of Government growth, higher taxes and, ultimately, a stagnating private sector, causing both inflation and unemployment. The President instead envisions a country with rejuvenated private enterprise, and a smaller, leaner, more efficient Government. Wealth will be returned to the people and away from the Government.

We have come a long way in a year. Congress enacted the basic legislation last year which set the economic recovery in motion. More still needs to be done here in Washington, but I am confident that Congress will continue to work with the administration to achieve the desired legislative goals.

However, legislation and Presidential actions alone cannot do the whole job. Without the active participation of the American people, the economic recovery will never get off the ground. Economic theories are one thing, but the program will work only through the day-to-day efforts of each American.

In this spirit, the Washingtonian magazine recently asked President Reagan for his one-on-one advice to Americans on what each of us can do to help the economy recover. He responded, and his answer appeared in the January issue of the magazine. After appearing in the Washingtonian, the letter was picked up by several other media organizations who did stories on it.

The President's letter contains excellent advice. I greatly appreciate the President for taking the time to convey his thoughts to every American, and I greatly appreciate the Washingtonian for requesting them. Mr. President, I ask that the full text of the President's letter, as it appeared in the Washingtonian, be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

[From the Washingtonian, January 1980]

A LETTER FROM PRESIDENT REAGAN

NOW MORE THAN EVER, IT PAYS TO WORK HARD AND SAVE

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 1, 1982.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICANS: With all the complex economic jargon we've been hearing about budgets, taxes, and supply-side economics, we sometimes overlook the crucial point: Our program will stand or fall, America will regain its economic health or fail to regain it on what we as individuals collectively do.

The most successful, dynamic economies in the world today are those based on faith in individuals who are given incentives to succeed; economies where it is understood that growth, prosperity, and ultimately human fulfillment itself are created from the people up, not the government down.

For too long our government has not had enough faith in you. It has stood in your way, taking more of what you earn no matter how hard you try. Years of government spending and taxation growing faster than the private economy created the conditions we inherited last January—double-digit inflation, the highest interest rates since the Civil War, and a national debt ready to burst through the trillion-dollar barrier.

America was not put on this earth just to make government bigger. Our mission has always been to expand freedom and create better lives for our people. Americans everywhere are yearning for a chance to produce again and to save their money and have those savings mean something. That's what our program is all about, putting this economy and America's future back in your hands where they belong. Here are three important ways you can help:

First, make the Congress understand it must stop overspending.

You are careful about how much you spend, and with your support we began last summer to make government do the same. We reduced the growth of the 1982 budget by $35 billion and we did it without jeopardizing the essential programs of the safety net.

Unfortunately, the Congress still exceeds its spending targets and Big Government is not yet under control. The budget has doubled since 1975, tripled since 1970. The cure we all want is not easy or painless. If it were, this problem would have been solved long ago. We will need your continued, strong support if we are to succeed where everyone else has failed.

Second, tell your representatives not to touch your tax cut.

Some of the people who never wanted you to have a tax cut are now trying to take it away from you even before it is fully in effect. Don't let them.

The Congress already weakened the economy unnecessarily by forcing us to delay your tax reduction. Doing so again in an attempt to balance the budget on the backs of you, the taxpayers, would be a tragic mistake. Let's remember that the income tax reduction you'll be receiving will barely offset the built-in tax increases between now and 1984 approved by my predecessor.

Contrary to what some in Washington think, Americans are not robots with iron backs and bottomless pockets who work only to pay taxes. They work for their families and their future, which isn't easy when they're shouldering the highest tax burden in our history. Asking them for more money now would be like asking Max Schmeling to pick himself up to go another round with Joe Louis.

During the last twenty years, the Congress raised taxes to record levels but managed to balance the budget just once. It did not tax to get money it needed; it spent whatever money it could get—and a lot of money it didn't have. So if the deficit continues to grow it will not be because your tax cut was too big, but because spending cuts are too small.

Third, take full advantage of the incentives in the new tax laws.

They were designed to help you and to bring excitement, opportunity, and growth back into our economy. The tax reductions now taking hold represent the greatest collection of incentives for the average family in the last 50 years. You, the members of working America, will receive the lion's share of the benefits.

Your tax rates will be reduced by 25 percent. A typical family of four earning $25,000 a year will receive a tax cut of approximately $400 in 1982, $1,000 in 1984, and $1,500 in 1986. Beginning in 1985, your tax rates will be indexed providing permanent protection against inflation.

The new law offers you many other possibilities for significant tax reductions. The marriage penalty is being cut, the child-care credit increased, and the personal exemption indexed for inflation. The maximum tax on both investment income and capital gains has also been reduced.

Millions of Americans are already taking advantage of the tax-exempt All Savers certificates. Also, the maximum deductible contribution you can make to an Individual Retirement Account (IRA) has been increased—from $1,500 to $2,000, or from $1,750 to $2,250 if you have a non-working spouse. If both you and your spouse are working you can deduct up to $4,000. For those of you who are self-employed, your maximum deductible contribution for a retirement plan has doubled from $7,500 to $15,000.

As long as you don't withdraw your money early, it will not be taxed before you retire (when your tax rate should drop), and until then you are free to deposit it in a wide variety of investments. Even if you can afford to save only $1,000 a year—that's less than $20 a week—your $30,000 in deposits over 30 years could generate a retirement fund well in excess of $100,000. Little taxpayers can become big providers

The policies of tax, tax, spend and spend nearly wrecked our economy. It's no wonder America has the lowest rate of personal savings of any major, industrialized country; and savings are the lifeblood of investment and economic growth. The key to recovery lies with more savings, more production, more investment.

You can make them happen. From now on, if you work or save more than you did before, your reward will be higher than it was. More of every added dollar of earnings from your office, shop, stock, or interest on your savings will be yours to keep.

This is what we mean by incentives, and this is what will ignite the tremendous drive and creativity of our people, qualities too long suppressed.

One final point: For our program to work, you won't have to work eighteen hours a day, give up your vacations, and save every penny you earn. Small changes multiplied by a work force of 100 million people will produce substantial benefits nationwide.

If the average number of hours worked per week rises by just half an hour, the Gross National Product will rise by $25 billion. If the personal savings rate increases by just two percentage points, we can add at least $40 billion a year to the nation's savings pool to finance new investments, new jobs, and a new America.

We worked together to get this program passed. We need to work together to keep it passed and to make it succeed. This is one opportunity we must not allow to slip away.

The spirit that built America was a bold spirit, not a timid one. It was a feeling of pride, optimism, and confidence that we could do anything. We still can. Dollar by dollar, we can save for our future, and we can save America's future.

But let's begin. Let's go forward in 1982 with faith and determination, and not be misled by those unwilling to say good-bye to their failed policies of the past.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. **BURDICK**. Mr. President, during the past several months, the hearts of all of us in the free world have been with the troubled people of Poland. We feel a deep solidarity with their efforts to establish a free society, and suffer with them in the face of continued repression of their hopes and dreams.

As we pray for our friends in Poland, let us also take this time to pay tribute to the heroic efforts of the Ukrainian people to free their land from Soviet bondage. January 22 was the 64th anniversary of the Ukraine's declaration of independence. On this occasion, we salute the Ukrainian people's nobility of spirit, and express the fervent hope that we may one day see a free Ukraine. Mr. President, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD a very moving letter I received from the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. The letter chronicles the fierce struggle of the people of the Ukraine to free themselves from Soviet domination.

The letter follows:

UKRANINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH
OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Warren, Mich., January 14, 1982.

Re anniversary of Ukraine's freedom and independence.

Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,
U.S. Senator from North Dakota, Russell Senate Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: January 22nd is the Anniversary of one of the most important dates in the modern history of Ukraine—that of the rebirth of the independent Ukrainian state.

With the fall of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empires, both of which controlled Ukrainian territory at the time, the Ukraninans, who for centuries had been resisting foreign domination of their country, took decisive steps toward their national freedom. On January 22, 1918 the Ukrainians declared their full and unqualifed independence from all foreign powers.

The Ukrainian Revolution immediately took on an essentially national character. A central Council (Central Rada) was established in Kiev, capital of Ukraine, and became the center of the Ukrainian liberation movement. It organized the Ukraninian National Army, established Ukrainian Schools, introduced Ukrainian administrative and judicial systems, and prepared a Ukrainian Constituent Assembly. By these actions it established a full-fledged independent state—The Ukrainian National Republic.

After a heroic struggle lasting three years, the Ukrainian National Republic, as we all know, succumbed to the numerically superior military forces of Communist Russia.

The alien Communist power destroyed the Ukrainian National state and replaced it with a puppet and subservient geovernment, the "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic". Even though it became a charter member of the United Nations in 1945, it is not a true government of the Ukrainian people, but an instrument of the Russian Soviet colonial empire, which enslaves and brutally persecutes the Ukrainian people.

Ukraine, with a population of 50 million, embraces 289,000 sq. mi., making it the largest county in Europe: in population it ranks fifth, and its natural resources make Ukraine one of the richest European countries. Its capital, Kiev, was the center of eastern European trade and culture long before Moscow was built. Despite its size and wealth, Ukraine is practically unknown: for most people it is "just a part of Russia". This gross misconception stems from the common practice of using the terms "Russia" and "Soviet Union" synonymously. This is incorrect because Russia is only one of many republics which make up the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Ever since the conquest of Ukraine by Communist Russia in 1920, the Ukrainian people have suffered political and cultural repression, economic exploitation, and all-encompassing russification. Both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches were destroyed brutally. In an enforced collectivization of Ukraine's agriculture in 1932-33, some 7 to 10 million Ukrainians were starved to death by the government-sponsored famine. During and after World War II, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians were deported, exiled or annihilated for their support of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) and for Ukrainian Nationalist Organization (OUN) both of which fought against the Nazis and later the Soviet Russian occupation of Ukraine.

On the 64th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukraine's independence on January 22nd, 1918, and the 63rd anniversary of the Act of Union on January 22nd, 1919, whereby all Ukrainian lands were united into one sovereign and independent state of the Ukrainian people, the true ideal of Ukrainian Independence lives on in the hearts and minds of the Ukrainian people, as attested to by the writings, memoranda, appeals and trials of Ukranian patriots—dissidents in Ukraine. In mid-1979, 18 prominent Ukrainian political prisoners and members of the Ukrainian Helsinki Group, from the USSR, appealed to the U.N. to take appropriate steps for Ukraine's secession from the USSR, which they called an "occupational government" installed by Communist Russia. In early 1980 an appeal from the "Ukrainian Patriotic Front" supporting the statement of other Ukrainian dissidents called for the secession of Ukraine from the Soviet Union.

At this time, when the free world is stunned by the Soviet seizure of Afghanistan and Moscow's readiness to move into Poland, the anniversary of Ukraine's Independence is a reminder of the fact that Moscow's aggression and conquest of independent nations is not a novel development.

In the past years many U.S. Senators and Congressmen, governors and mayors, paid tribute to the Ukrainian people on the anniversary of Ukrainian Independence in official proclamations and statements, thus giving encouragement and hope to Ukrainians in their struggle for the rebirth of Ukraine's freedom and independence to which they are rightfully entitled under the law of God.

Sincerely yours,

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
Hon. President UCCA
State Branch of North Dakota.●

GUATEMALA

● Mr. **DURENBERGER**. Mr. President, despite the attention being devoted to Western and Eastern Europe during these difficult times, many of us continue to be deeply concerned about what is happening in our own hemisphere, specifically in Central America. It is too easy to forget that "Central America" is a term we use only for geographic convenience. The region comprises several unique countries, each of which has unique problems. We must remind ourselves constantly that what unites Central America—language, culture, and traditions—is often less important than what divides it.

There are many differences in what is happening in these countries. In Nicaragua, the people's revolution has overthrown a despotic dictator, only to see the Sandinistas commit similar abuses of human rights and civil liberties. The promised elections have yet to be held, the militia is growing beyond the size of Somoza's elite National Guard, and prominent business leaders who dissent with the junta's policies are jailed. In Nicaragua, as elsewhere, those who make a revolution are often its first victims.

In neighboring El Salvador, elections are scheduled for late March. For the most part, the leftist opposition has rejected participation in the elections, refusing to renounce violence as a political and military tactic. The junta is frustrated in its attempts to restrict Soviet influence and arms shipments to the guerrillas. But the important point is that the elections will be held. People may differ about what it will accomplish, but an election may give us the best estimate yet of what people of El Salvador want for their future.

In Honduras, we note a cautious return to democratic rule. Recent elections there give us hope that the military will stand back and let civilian political leaders develop new priorities and programs for the government. It remains to be seen whether the military will allow that to happen, but at least for the present the signs are very encouraging.

In Guatemala, the hope for freedom and dignity is dimmest. The Guatemalan military, in direct contrast to that of El Salvador, has never contemplated dramatic or far-reaching changes in the political or economic structure. Instead, there has been repression and a cynical disregard for human rights. The government, which derides its numerous opponents by labeling them "communists," has done nothing to correct the abuses that are there for all to see.

Since 1977, the United States has refused to sanction the government-directed violence and terror against the people. Economic and military aid have been suspended, and there is little likelihood that they will be reinstated. In a tentative hope that we might induce moderation, the Reagan administration approved the sale of a few jeeps and trucks to the Guatemalan regime. However, the administration quickly realized that the anticipated influence over Guatemalan domestic policies had not developed. Had our tactics succeeded, we might have been in a position to exert influence over the Guatemalan military leaders and bring about an improvement in the human rights situation. But relations between our two countries remain tense and strained because of the cumulative effect of decades of excess.

The Washington Post has devoted considerable editorial space recently to our relations with the nations in Central America. I was encouraged by the paper's support of elections in El Salvador and its calming words about the administration's relations with Nicaragua. Once again, I find myself in agreement with the Post's sentiments concerning Guatemala. As the editorial of January 24 illustrates, the Guatemalan military must soon realize that its domestic policies of terror and violence prohibit U.S. support of its plans to eliminate the leftist threat. Only when this lesson has sunk in can we hope for improvements in the human rights of the Guatemalan people.

Mr. President, I ask that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the Record.

The editorial follows:

Hands Off Guatemala

Did you see that front-page picture of a Guatemalan soldier firing a machine gun out of a helicopter at a village suspected of harboring guerrillas? Nothing could be seen down there except a dog, reported The Post's Christopher Dickey, who was riding along. For many Americans, it must have been a scene reminiscent of the frustrations of the United States' own last war against an elusive guerrilla enemy.

There is one big difference, however. Guatemala's is not an American war. This administration has sent the government a bit of semi-military aid around the edges, but otherwise it has apparently kept hands off, despite its nervousness about the guerrillas. It should keep hands off.

There is a debate over whether and in what ways the United States should support the civilian-military junta in El Salvador but, there is not much to say for supporting the dictatorship of Gen. Romeo Lucas Garcia. Not even those administration officials who lean to accepting him as a useful anti-communist are eager to come forward and make a case for aid.

For good reason. Gen. Garcia, by the word of human rights advocates and American intelligence alike, is the bloodiest leader ruling in the hemisphere. He is ready to advertise his fight against the guerrillas—a fight in which, in one campaign, his chief of staff reports, his forces killed 2,000 people identified as guerrillas. He shields his part in the killing, by the armed forces and by paramilitary death squads associated with them, of literally thousands of civilians. It has been confirmed that these operations are under his direct control.

Noting the slaughter in Guatemala, we asked last year whether it might make sense for the United States to try to acquire a little civilizing influence with the government by resuming the military contacts that Jimmy Carter had cut off. The Reagan administration subsequently gave this policy a certain test, and enough results are in to provide a judgment: it failed. During the period that the administration dangled the prospect of improved ties, Gen. Garcia, evidently misunderstanding the signal, stepped up his policy of indiscriminate civilian killings.

To be sure, guerrilla activity is up, too. And though guerrilla groups go back to the pre-Castro years, some of their current operations are no doubt Cuban-supported. What about that? It's a fair question. But it's a question for Gen. Garcia. He's the one deepening the sea in which the guerrilla fish swim. Perhaps if he comes to realize that his tactics render it out of the question for the United States to support him, he will change his tactics.●

HANDGUNS: WHERE CIVILIZATION STOPS

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, every year more than 10,000 Americans die from handgun violence and a quarter of a million more are threatened or wounded in handgun crime.

As the Los Angeles Times wrote in a recent editorial, "the figures are grim and getting worse." The Times arrived at this conclusion following an extensive series of articles on the spread of handguns in California—a story that is unfortunately repeated in every State in the Nation.

One of the more disturbing findings in the Los Angeles Times' report is that handguns are sold indiscriminately despite California State law governing the sale and purchase of guns. This is done at so-called "gun shows."

Licensed gun dealers in California are requred to send special handgun transaction forms to the California Department of Justice before any handgun sale. Dealers and nondealers alike are required to wait 15 days from the date of application for sale before delivering a handgun to a buyer. Convicted felons, drug addicts, and mental patients are prohibited from buying handguns. But these handgun laws are little observed at most California gun shows.

The Times says, "Despite these laws, virtually anyone with the cash can buy handguns, on the spot, from so-called nondealers who operate at gun shows." It adds "unlicensed sellers go from gun show to gun show marketing handguns weekend after weekend at different locations in the State . . . law enforcement agencies do little to police these shows."

The Times' editorial concludes that "State gun laws, like California's, if vigorously enforced, may help reduce the carnage, but what is needed is a national law making handguns illegal. No society can truly call itself civilized and continue to tolerate the spread of these weapons of death."

Mr. President, I strongly agree, and that is the goal of the bill Congressman Rodino and I introduced in this Congress—S. 974, the "Handgun Crime Control Act of 1981."

I want to commend the Los Angeles Times and its reporter, John Hurst, for an outstanding series on a public policy issue that literally means life and death for too many Americans.

Mr. President, I ask that the Times' editorial and series of articles on "California's Gun Explosion" be printed at this point in the Record.

The material is as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 23, 1981]

Where Civilization Stops

The figures are grim and getting worse, and the payoff is death.

Californians bought nearly 290,000 new handguns last year. That figure is a continuation of the upward trend in handgun sales that has persisted for nearly 20 years in this state.

Californians bought more than 1.8 million guns from 1971 to 1980. These figures do not include the purchase of used guns, nor do they include the large number of unregulated handgun sales at gun shows each weekend over the state. Laws covering the sale and ownership of guns in this state are ignored at these events. State, local and federal officials are aware of these violations. They hardly make even a feeble effort to enforce the laws.

The number of Californians authorized to carry concealed weapons in California is growing at a rate more than 10 times faster than the increase in population. Last year 38,513 persons had permits to carry concealed weapons.

As Times staff writer John Hurst noted in his comprehensive report on the spread of guns in California, as the number of guns in private hands increases, so does the number of gun-related deaths.

The statistics are ominous. In 1976, gunfire victims were 54 percent of the total number of homicides in the state that year. By 1980, 61 percent of the homicide victims died from gunfire. And the favorite firearm used in most of these deaths is the handy handgun, which in 1980 accounted for 77 percent of firearm homicides.

The alarming increase in the number of firearms among the civilian population of the state is caused by rising crime and the justified rising fear of crime, but in more than 80 percent of the homicides the victims are acquaintances or relatives of the people who pull the triggers. People who buy guns for protection no doubt feel more secure, but that is an illusion, statistics indicate. For example, in 1978 in California, private citizens killed 58 felons, but 99 persons accidentally shot themselves to death.

The surging gun sales in California and throughout the nation are a national calamity. The handgun death toll nationally amounts to more than 10,000 a year, and this horrifying figure does not include the wounded and the thousands of persons victimized by crimes in which handguns are used. Nobody is safe—not even the President of the United States, who only a few brief months ago came within an inch of death from a bullet fired by a mentally unbalanced man who bought a gun as easily as he could have bought a lollypop at a candy store.

State gun laws, like California's, if vigorously enforced may help reduce the carnage, but what is needed is a national law making handguns illegal. No society can truly call itself civilized and continue to tolerate the spread of these weapons of death.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 20, 1981]

Gun Sales, Homicides: Both Rising

(Series of articles by John Hurst, Times staff writer)

Consider the gun.

"It's called the equalizer," the man says. "The power of life and death. . . . In society today, most people are afraid. A gun can make you fearless. . . . You have to respect anything that does that."

The man talking is Deputy Atty. Gen. William R. Pounders, specialist in weapons-control laws for the state Department of Justice.

He is trying to explain the fascination that people have with guns.

"There is also a tie," he says, "to people who have been made notorious by the gun. . . . Wyatt Earp . . . and the outlaws . . .. the Daltons and the James Gang, they all became powerful by using the gun. And there is the feeling that you are powerful because you have a gun. . . .

"They (guns) are aesthetically attractive," he continues, "I can't explain why. . . . They're beautiful, the well-crafted gun. You have to respect it, even if you don't like it."

A lot of people in California must share Pounders' fascination.

State statistics indicate that Californians bought nearly 289,000 new handguns last year.

The number of gun transactions reported in the state has gone up nearly every year for two decades.

From 1971 to 1980, Californians bought more than 1.8 million new handguns. Each year, some police jurisdictions destroy guns confiscated during criminal investigations. But these guns represent less than 10 percent of the number purchased in any given year.

Even if 10 percent of the new handguns purchase during the last decade had been destroyed, it would still leave one handgun for about every five households in the state.

It is not necessarily true, of course, that there is a handgun in every fifth household, because some households posses more than one gun. But it should be noted that these sales figures do not include new guns bought before 1971. Nor do they include purchases of used guns. Nor do they include purchases of shotguns and rifles, which are not registered in California.

It should also be noted that these figures do not include the large number of unregulated sales of guns, new and used, that occur at weekend "gun shows" all over the state.

As Pounders indicates, many people own guns because they are afraid. But, ironically, the criminals they are afraid of are stealing the very guns that are supposed to keep them at bay.

"If you keep it (a gun) safe enough so that the burglar can't find it," Pounders says, "then you can't get to it for self-protection."

Pounders himself lost three of his four handguns to burglars. One of the stolen guns is a high-powered 45-caliber semiautomatic pistol.

"So," he sighs, "law-enforcement officers might find that gun being used against them."

Last year, 18,685 handguns were reported stolen in California.

During the last five years, more than 73,000 handguns were reported stolen in the state.

But theft is not the major problem with guns in California. Death is the major problem.

As the number of guns in the state increases, so does the number of gun-related deaths.

In 1976, state Department of Justice statistics indicate that 1,170 people were victims of firearm homicides in California. Gunfire victims were 54 percent of the total homicides that year.

In 1980, the total number of gunfire victims had climbed to 2,011, or 61 percent of the homicides in the state.

Guns have helped push homicide into the top 10 causes of death in the state.

Homicide was not among the 10 principal causes of death listed by the state Department of Health Services from 1969 through 1976.

Then in 1977, with a boost from gunfire, homicide became the ninth-leading cause of death in California, just behind obstructive respiratory diseases and just ahead of arteriosclerosis.

The type of firearm used in most of these homicides in California is the handgun.

State statistics indicate that in 1980 handguns were used in 77 percent of firearm homicides.

The people who die by gunfire in California are acquaintances, lovers or relatives of the killers in more than 80 percent of the cases. Records also show that all seven police officers killed in the line of duty in California last year died in gunfire: four by handguns, two by rifles and one by shotgun.

In 1978, for example, private citizens in California killed 58 felons who were committing crimes or trying to escape crime scenes. During the same year, 99 people in the state accidentally shot themselves to death.

The overall statistical evidence is overwhelming: A gun is far more likely to be stolen, to be used to kill a friend or relative or to cause an accidental death than to be used successfully for protection.

Still, an increasing number of Californians buck those odds.

The posh Beverly Hills Gun Club of West Los Angeles was established for such people earlier this year.

Arthur M. Kassel, president of the club, says that "self-defense and protection of the family" are the most common reasons people give for joining his organization.

Doris Weber, of Malibu, is one of those people.

The 58-year-old Weber stands on Kassel's gun range, ear protectors clamped on her head, her feet planted a couple of feet apart and her arms stretched out before her as her 2-month-old Smith & Wesson .38-caliber revolver barks in her hands.

"It's a lovely little gun," she says later. "I love it."

It is the first gun Weber has owned. She is still learning to shoot it, and looks with pride at the cluster of holes she has shot in the chest of a silhouette target of a man.

Weber is learning to hit stationary targets, but would she have the skills, the reflexes, the training and the judgment to use the gun in a life-and-death situation?

Asked what she would do if a burglar broke into her home, she replies:

"The first thing I would do is press the alarm. And that starts the damn bells ringing. And if that didn't work, I'd take the gun. . . . I'd tell him, 'I've got a gun' . . . I don't want to hurt anybody. I just don't want anybody breaking in my house."

Weber's fear of crime and her response to it are typical of many Californians. But the response of her husband is typical of many others: He doesn't want anything to do with guns.

"My husband doesn't want to see the gun," she says. "I'm going to keep it by my bed, but my husband doesn't want to know where it is."

The disagreement over guns within the Weber household is going on in other forums throughout the state and promises to heat up within the next few months as backers of a gun-control initiative seek signatures.

The initiative organizers, like most gun-control advocates, zero in on the handgun, pointing out that this easily concealed weapon is used more frequently in homicides than any other gun.

Apparently hoping to steal some of the law-and-order thunder from the pro-gun forces, the backers of the initiative have dubbed themselves Californians Against Street Crime and Concealed Weapons.

This organization grew out of the efforts of the small and underfinanced Coalition for Handgun Control, which, using a staff of 1½ paid positions and a number of volunteers, has tried to battle the well-heeled pro-gun lobby in California.

But Los Angeles attorney John Phillips, co-chairman of the coalition and executive director of the Citizens Against Street Crime, is optimistic about the chances for the handgun-control initiative. The campaign, he says, has begun drawing some powerful political and financial support.

The initiative, if it qualifies for the November ballot and if the voters approve it, will:

Require that all handguns in the state be registered within a year.

Declare all unregistered handguns contraband and subject to confiscation.

Freeze the number of handguns in the state by prohibiting the sale within California or transportation into the state of any more handguns.

Decree a mandatory six-month jail term for conviction of carrying a concealed weapon in public and a mandatory one-year jail term for multiple counts of illegal handgun sales.

In the meantime, the pro-gun people are gearing up their defense.

Richard A. Cox, California lobbyist for the National Rifle Assn. says the California Rifle & Pistol Assn., has already kicked in a quick $40,000 to fight the initiative.

And this, he promises, is only the beginning.

"We're going to spend whatever it takes," he says of the wealthy rifle association. "We could generate several million dollars without any problem."

Registration of handguns, the pro-gun forces argue, is a futile measure because criminals would not register their guns, and convicted felons are already prohibited from possessing handguns under current law.

What is needed, they argue, is for the laws on the books to be enforced.

As for all the crimes of passion committed with guns, Earl W. Huntting, president of Citizens for Law and Order of the San Francisco Bay Area, comments:

"In a fit of passion, people that are going to seek revenge on someone are going to find a way—maybe a gun is less messy, I don't know."

Many pro-gun people are convinced that the ultimate goal of gun-control advocates is confiscation of all firearms, even though initiative backers have gone to some length to defuse these fears.

Initiatie advocate Phillips refers, for example, to provisions of the measure as a "Handgun Bill of Rights."

He argues, for example, that the initiative would remove the authority of the state Legislature to ban the ownership of handguns.

But the pro-gun forces are well aware that there is no chance that the Legislature would take such an action regardless of the initiative.

Just how unlikely such an action would be was illustrated earlier this year by the fate of a mild clause in a crime bill authored by Sen. Edward M. Davis (R-Chatsworth), former Los Angeles police chief.

In a bill to increase prison sentences for certain violent crimes, Davis added clauses that would require the destruction of the weapons used in these crimes. Current law allows local jurisdictions to decide what to do with confiscated guns. Some departments, such as the Los Angeles Police Department, destroy them, but others sell them at auctions.

Davis, a lifetime member of the rifle association and a strong supporter of the right to own guns, was astounded when the weapons-destruction clauses were vehemently opposed and ultimately defeated by the association.

Davis recalls his argument with an association representative:

"'Well,' I said, 'you're against the death penalty for guns.'"

Davis goes on to say:

"They (the association) object to any legislation that singles out firearms. . . . I told them, 'Bullshit, I had about two officers a year killed on duty (while he was chief of the LAPD) and except for a few who were killed in automobile accidents, they were all killed by gunfire.

"I'm not saying I'm right," he continues, "I just say when you stand up there and give the widow the American flag and she's weeping, you just don't think that the gun that killed him and the gun used to kill other people . . . should go out into circulation."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 21, 1981]

Firearm Sales: the Gun Show Connection

WEAPONS OFTEN SOLD WITH NO ID, NO WAITING, NO QUESTIONS ASKED

San Bernardino—The man standing at the table looking at the handguns for sale is a convicted armed robber.

He spent nearly 10 years in state prisons after going on a rampage of robbery and kidnaping up and down California.

He has committed more than 100 stickups by his own reckoning. He pulled his last armed robbery about 10 years ago, but when money is tight, he is still tempted to pick up a gun.

"I'm seriously contemplating it," he admits. "If it could go down right, I would book it."

He looks over the dozen or so handguns on the table in front of him and selects a brand new .38 caliber revolver.

The man behind the table wants $170 for the five-shot, Brazilian-made Rossi handgun.

The ex-stickup man offers him $160. The seller accepts it and takes the cash. The former holdup man takes the gun and walks away.

It's that easy. No identification has been shown. No names were exchanged between buyer and seller. There was no 15-day waiting period. There is no record of this transaction.

All of which makes it illegal.

The purchase of the revolver occurred at a so-called gun show at the National Orange Showgrounds in San Bernardino.

In this case, the ex-holdup man was working with The Times to demonstrate how openly the laws regulating gun sales are being violated in California. He immediately turned over the revolver to a reporter.

A Times reporter bought eight other handguns and ammunition this fall at gun shows from Chico in Northern California to Anaheim in Southern California. Each sale was illegal. The guns ranged in price from $34 for an old revolver to $170 for a new handgun. Seven guns were bought without presenting any identification, and one gun was purchased on the strength of a Santa Barbara City Recreation Department card bearing a blurry photograph of the reporter. All these handguns were sold cash and carry, no waiting period.

Such illegal on-the-spot handgun sales go on openly at gun shows throughout the state at state and county fairgrounds, convention centers and, in at least one case, a public school: El Camino High in Sacramento County.

Gun shows in California provide the setting for a multimillion-dollar illicit industry.

A state Board of Equalization official estimated that thousands of dollars in sales taxes went uncollected at a giant gun show held at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds last month. The magnitude of the event was so great and the gun sellers were so uncooperative, he said, that his agents could not cope with it.

It is illegal under both state and federal law to deal in handguns without a license. But top state and federal firearms officials told The Times that their agencies have been pressured by pro-gun forces to lay off the gun shows where thousands and thousands of guns are put up for sale on weekends by unlicensed vendors.

At the local level, law enforcement agencies not only fail to enforce gun laws at these shows, but gun show promoters hire off-duty policemen, including Los Angeles Police Department officers, to guard the weapons that are being sold illegally.

California law prohibits non-dealers from selling a handgun to a person who is not personally known to the seller. In other words, it is against the law for a "private party" to sell a hangun to a stranger.

Licensed gun dealers are required to submit forms containing details of a proposed handgun transaction to the state Department of Justice in Sacramento. There, a statewide record check of the prospective buyer's background is made before the handgun may be delivered. Convicted felons, drug addicts and mental patients are prohibited from buying handguns.

Dealers and non-dealers alike are required to wait 15 days from the date of application for sale before delivering a handgun to a buyer. This serves both as a "cooling-off" period to prevent crimes of passion and as a time period in which record checks can be made in sales involving dealers.

State law requires that handgun sellers be licensed dealers unless their sales are "occasional and without regularity."

Federal law also requires gun dealers to be licensed, but the federal definition of what constitutes dealing is not as clear as state law.

Selling handguns in violation of state law is a misdemeanor punishable by up to six months in jail and/or a $500 fine. Selling guns without a federal license is a felony punishable by up to five years in prison and/or a $5,000 fine.

Despite these laws, virtually anyone with the cash can buy handguns, on the spot, from so-called non-dealers who operate at gun shows. These sellers peddle handguns to strangers. And, while many non-dealers insist that the buyer present some kind of identification, many do not. None of the non-dealers that The Times saw operating at gun shows all over the state observed the legally mandated 15-day colling-off period before turning over a handgun to a buyer.

And although state and federal laws require gun dealers to obtain licenses, the same unlicensed sellers go from gun show to gun show, marketing handguns weekend after weekend at different locations in the state.

Law enforcement agencies do little to police these shows.

William R. Pounders, the top weapons-control lawyer for the state attorney general's office, and a gun enthusiast himself, recalled the pressure he received when state agents investigated gun shows in the mid-1970s.

"We originally got into the gun shows because of our own investigations," Pounders said. "Some of our agents went out to the shows and saw numerous violations (including cash-and-carry handgun sales). And they saw what they believed to be a known felon buying a handgun and leaving with the handgun.

"They then brought their information to me," he continued, "and I verified that what they saw in each case was a violation of state law. Our department . . . sent circulars out to various local law enforcement agencies."

Pounders says that the state Department of Justice was subsequently asked to take part in a local, state and federal task force to investigate gun shows and, in February, 1976, the agents, in search of stolen weapons, attended a show in Manhattan Beach.

"The minute we walked in the door," said Pounders, "they (show officials) announced our presence, so the gun dealers started putting away their guns."

Nevertheless, an arrest was made on a charge of possession of stolen guns.

And Pounders subsequently took some political heat for the investigation.

"I personally was called by two state senators," he recalled. One of them, he said, was Sen. H. L. Richardson (R-Arcadia).

"He (Richardson) wanted to know why we were harassing the gun show operators," Pounders said. "We said we were enforcing the law. We were just doing what the Legislature directed us to do . . .

"I'd rather not say what he (Richardson) said," Pounders continued. "He just criticized us for enforcing the law."

Pounders said of gun show operators:

"They are all well-connected politically, so they can put a lot of pressure on law enforcement (agencies) not to enforce the law at gun shows."

Richardson was away on a hunting trip and unavailable for comment, but his chief aide, Mike Carrington, responded to a Times inquiry about the senator's call to Pounders:

"I think I recall the time frame of that happening," Carrington said. "Sen. Richardson would be concerned with the manner in which they (the task force) were enforcing the law. There's nobody more law and order oriented than H. L. Richardson in California. And he certainly never advocates violating the law or not enforcing the law. There is a manner in which the law should be properly enforced. There can be instances of unnecessary harassment . . . and I think that is what he was stressing at that time."

State Atty. Gen. George Deukmejian says it is lack of manpower, not political pressure, that prevents his Justice Department from enforcing state gun laws. In addition, Deukmejian argues that such enforcement is a local responsiblity.

"It is not our primary responsibility to be enforcing violations of the penal code in every locality throughout the state," he said. "We generally are involved in cases that are either multicounty or statewide in terms of their impact."

Informed that some gun show promoters operate on a multicounty basis over wide regions of the state, Deukmejian insisted:

"This is primarily a responsibility for local law enforcement and not for the Department of Justice."

But, other than an occasional check for stolen guns, there appears to be no policing of gun shows by local law enforcement agencies.

"We're not doing anything, to my knowledge," said Capt. Dale Wilcox of the Police Department in Anaheim, where a major promoter stages a show at the Convention Center and where The Times bought a handgun, cash-and-carry.

Uniformed Anaheim police officers are paid by the gun show promoter to guard the weapons at the Convention Center. Similarly, off-duty LAPD officers in plain clothes are hired for security work at the gun show held at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds in Pomona, where The Times bought another cash-and-carry gun.

Local law enforcement officials often display ignorance of state gun laws and indicate that the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (BATF) is responsible for enforcement of all firearms laws at gun shows.

But federal agents complain that the gun lobby—the National Rifle Assn. (NRA), in particular—has stymied federal law enforcement efforts at the shows.

The BATF—which has been continually at loggerheads with the NRA—has been the agency responsible for enforcing federal firearms laws at gun shows.

But for more than two years, agents of the bureau have been prohibited by superiors in Washington from investigating the shows except under very limited circumstances.

"Authorization has to be given from headquarters (in Washington) before we can go to a gun show and work," explained Robert Skopeck, chief agent for the bureau in the Los Angeles area.

The grounds for such authorization were spelled out before a U.S. Senate subcommittee on July 12, 1979, by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Richard J. Davis.

After an NRA official complained of harassment at gun shows and called the bureau a "rogue agency," Davis assured the senators:

"BATF has limited its investigations of gun shows and flea markets to situations where there are specific allegations that significant violations have occurred and where there is reliable information that guns sold at the specific show or flea markets have shown up in crimes of violence with some degree of regularity."

The bureau's agents were prohibited, explained Skopeck in Los Angeles, from simply going to gun shows to see if the laws were being broken.

"It's pressure from the NRA," Skopeck said. "The NRA is a very strong lobby. . . . They are so strong, they have gotten us in a bind."

The BATF is in more than a bind. The Reagan Administration is disbanding the bureau and assigning its responsibilities to other federal agencies.

In the meantime, the shows go on.

The events do contain an element of showmanship along with the salesmanship. Collectors display all types of weapons, many of them antique, and some are not for sale.

The shows are often fantasylands of a sort where people play out their roles with lethal toys. Grown men walk around dressed as Union soldiers armed with six-shooters, while others swagger about in black gunslinger outfits as others stalk along in battle camouflage and berets, carrying military rifles with deadly looking banana clips.

A man stops at a table to examine small semi-automatic pistols and talks to a vendor about the need for a "backup gun," apparently in case his everyday gun jams.

A vendor mentions that a particular handgun will fit nicely in the prospective customer's boot.

At the gun show at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds, members of the National Guard invite showgoers to tour a modern tank as a man strolls by dressed as a Mexican bandit, wearing a huge sombrero and bandoliers crossed on his chest.

Long rows of tables at the shows offer everything from assault rifles to cap pistols.

But with all the fantasy and all the dogma, the main business of the gun show is business.

And it is big business.

Steve Breitel, who runs Showmasters, is one of a half-dozen major gun show promoters based in Southern California. Brietel stages 30 to 35 gun shows a year all over the state, according to his assistant, Alvin Seal.

At a recent show in San Bernardino, Breitel was renting 450 to 500 vending tables to sellers at $32 to $35 each. In addition, 6,000 to 7,000 showgoers were expected to attend at $3.75 each at the door.

Based on Seal's figures, Breitel's shows alone probably gross more than $1 million per year.

Don Bullock of Long Beach puts on several shows per year, each attended by about 400 sellers who pay about $50 apiece for vending tables.

But for sheer size of the event, Frank Barnyak, a Los Angeles area executive with Bell Helicopter, seems to be the king of the gun show promoters.

Barnyak puts on two giant gun shows per year at the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds. The three-day extravaganzas, considered the largest events of their kind in the country, are held in five huge showrooms and a central open patio.

He advertises 2,700 vending tables and charges sellers $28.50 for a table and $125 for a booth.

Barnyak says that 10,000 to 15,000 people buy tickets, priced at $3.25 each for adults, to enter his show.

Gerald Doty, compliance supervisor with the State Board of Equalization, attended Barnyak's gun show last month in a futile attempt to ensure collection of 6% sales tax on gun transactions.

"We were actually amazed at the size of the thing," Doty said. "There was just wall-to-wall people, wall-to-wall guns."

Many of the sellers, said Doty, refused to cooperate with tax men, and the tax men, awed by the size of the event and the number of weapons, decided to fall back and regroup.

"We met with a lot resistance," Doty said. "As far as I know, we didn't get a nickle's worth of tax out of it. . . . We're not going to stand there in front of a guy who has five handguns and demand to see his ID."

How much money in taxes went uncollected?

"I have no idea," Doty said. "It could run into thousands of dollars. . . . For every hundred dollar bill that changed hands, there's $6 (in potential taxes). And there were a lot of those changing hands."

What the gun sellers make at the various shows is anyone's guess, but one peddler of cheap handguns told The Times that he sells 30 to 40 handguns during a show. His cheapest guns sell for $65 to $75 each. He says he buys these cheap guns wholesale for $24 to $36. His figures indicate that he nets about $1,000, possibly more, for a weekend's work of illegal gun selling.

At the Los Angeles County Fairgrounds gun show last month, a vendor sat on a bench at the center of the event with boxes of .25-caliber semi-automatic pistols stacked at his feet. He was offering the guns, made by Raven Arms of Industry, Calif.—one of the most prolific manufacturers of semi-automatic pistols in the country—for $60 each, no identification, no waiting. The palm-sized Raven has become a popular item on the illicit gun market in the East and among small-time hoods, according to federal agents.

Another peddler of new Raven handguns, Paul Striar of Santa Barabara, sold The Times one of the weapons for $75 at a gun show in Culver City. There was no wait for delivery of the gun and Striar accepted the reporter's Santa Barbara City Recreation Department card, bearing a blurry photograph, as identification.

Striar, who is not a licensed gun dealer, obtains the guns from wholesalers by using his wife's dealers' license.

After The Times questioned him about his gun-selling operation, Striar and his wife reported to the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department that 100 to 150 new handguns along with Striar's record of the guns' serial numbers had been stolen from his home. Authorities said that the reported theft left hundreds of rounds of ammunition and other valuables untouched at Striar's home.

Another gun seller, Robert Miller of Kernville, who sold the ex-armed robber the .38-caliber Rossi revolver, told The Times that he recently sold 60 guns at a show, about 30 percent of them handguns.

Miller, who operates a Kernville motel, says he attends about 15 shows a year. He sells a variety of handguns, including the cheap Brazilian-made Rossi revolvers, for which he charges about $20 above the retail price.

"Nobody minds paying $20 more for a gun if they don't have to wait," Miller said.

And at gun shows there is usually no waiting.

They are just the thing, the promoters say, for the harried shopper.

"This show," advises a recorded telephone promotion for an Orange County gun show, "is two big days in which to do your last-minute Christmas shopping . . . . Plan on finding just the right item for that special person on your Christmas list."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 22, 1981]

GUN CAN'T DISTINGUISH FRIEND FROM ENEMY

It amused Greg Jenkins that one of his buddies ducked in fright behind the bed when he pulled out his grandmother's revolver. After all, the bullets didn't even fit the gun.

The four teen-agers were watching the rock musical "Jesus Christ Superstar" on a color TV in the bedroom of Greg's grandparents.

The youngsters were music enthusiasts and 17-year-old Greg was an accomplished imitator of his idol, Elvis Presley. Greg was also adventurous, even impulsive, so maybe he was getting bored with the popcorn that his grandmother had made and with the soda pop and the movie.

Whatever prompted him, he took his grandmother's handgun and a bullet from the nightstand beside the bed.

The boy and the gun had traveled thousands of miles on separate paths across the country before getting together on that Sunday evening last April 12. The boy was there in the pleasant Canyon Country house in northern Los Angeles County because his grandmother loved him so much. Greg was her favorite grandchild. The gun was there to protect the grandmother against intruders.

"If that shakes you up," Greg said to the youth who had ducked behind the bed, "this ought to blow your mind. . . ."

Gregory Lee Jenkins was born to 20-year-old Gerry Lee and 19-year-old Jackie Sue Perryman Jenkins at 6:22 a.m. on Jan. 11, 1964, at O'Connor Hospital in San Jose.

When Greg was about 4 years old, his family moved to Boca Raton, Fla., where his father worked as an engineer.

Greg's father had been on the pistol team in the Army, and as Greg grew up, he took the boy to gun ranges in Florida where the youngster learned to shoot and to handle weapons.

"He had done some (shooting) when he was a very small boy," said Greg's grandmother, Marjorie Alexander. "His father was an expert marksman . . . He (Greg) knew better than to horse around with a gun."

Greg led an active life growing up in Florida. he was athletic and suffered a badly broken leg playing football at 9 years of age.

In his teens, he suffered a more serious break—the divorce of his parents.

Greg has trouble dealing with that. His schooling suffered. His life seemed to be coming apart. He clung to his love of music, especially the music of Elvis.

It was at about this time that Charter Arms Corp. of Stratford, Conn., manufactured, in 1979, a .38-caliber snub-nosed, five-shot revolver called an "Undercover .38 Special," Serial No. 490487.

The Charter Arms people don't like to talk about it, but the company makes a lot of guns. Charter Arms made the .44-caliber handgun used by Son of Sam. Charter Arms made the revolver that killed John Lennon and the one that crippled George Wallace. Sara Jane Moore bought a Charter Arms before she decided upon a Smith & Wesson to shoot at former President Gerald R. Ford.

Undercover .38 Special Serial No. 490487 was one of 67,259 revolvers that Charter Arms reportedly produced in 1979.

The gun was shipped across the country to a dealer in St. George, Utah, and, later that same year, it was purchased by one of Greg's uncles for $98.

Greg's uncle, call him Joe—he doesn't want his name used—keeps guns handy in the restaurant he owns and operates in Utah.

"I personally feel," he said, "that a free people should be able to be armed if they desire. . . . There is no guarantee in life. It is in our tradition for us to decide whether we want to be a placid victim or a fighting victim. . . . There will be no hostages taken (by robbers) at the restaurant."

Joe and his wife also believe that it is only prudent to be armed against the bad times that they believe are coming.

"We feel that the country is falling apart economically," said Joe's wife. "And L.A. could be very unnice when it's down to a four-day food supply."

"I do know that only civilized men can defend civilization," Joe said. "It's not enough to build a church. You have to be able to defend the church against the marauders that come out of the desert."

In the fall of 1980, the year after Joe bought the Undercover .38 Special, Greg, who had been trying to live on his own in Florida, moved to Los Angeles County to live with his grandmother, Marjorie Alexander, and his step-grandfather, Hugh Alexander, in Canyon Country.

The youngster attended Canyon High School and quickly adjusted to his new home.

"I received a wonderful gift this year," Greg wrote in a school assignment. "That gift gave me the chance to start all over again in a new state and new school with new friends.

"I arrived here in California on September 17, 1980, tired, scared, still only just leaving Florida six hours ago.

"In Florida, at the age of 16, I was alone in a world I didn't know much about. . . . I had a long talk with my grandma and we decided that I would come live with her and go back to school full time and be a normal kid again.

"I love my grandma more than anyone else in this world next to my dad and little sister. And I will forever thank her for the chance she gave me to start over again."

Joe, in the meantime, became concerned back in Utah with news reports of violence in California and spoke by phone to his mother, Greg's grandmother, about protection.

"They were talking," recalled Greg's grandfather, "and he mentioned she should have a gun. And she said she didn't have one, and he said, 'If it's the money, I'll send you one.'"

So Joe sent his mother the Undercover .38 Special.

Greg's grandfather found some .38-caliber bullets and Marjorie Alexander showed the gun to Greg. The youngster quickly discovered that the bullets his grandfather had found were the right caliber but the wrong type and would slide right through the firing chambers of the cylinder. In short, those bullets would not work in that gun.

Marjorie Alexander planned to go to a firing range and learn to shoot the gun and, in the meantime, her husband put the weapon and the bullets in the couple's bedside table.

The gun lay in the drawer, largely ignored, while life went on in the neat three-bedroom house in the quiet neighborhood.

Greg attended school, where he sang in the chorus, performed an occasional Elvis imitation and took part in the legislative council.

He was no scholar, but he got by.

"He could have done better," acknowledged his grandmother, "but he didn't like to study."

But he liked to sing and he liked to drive fast. Too fast for his aunt, Linda Shapira, of nearby Valencia.

"He did like to show off," she said. "He felt like nothing could happen to him."

So it was a normal, nice-looking, brown-haired, blue-eyed, indestructible youth who got together with his buddies last April 12, to watch "Jesus Christ Superstar," eat popcorn and drink soda pop in the grandmother's bedroom.

When Greg took the gun from the drawer, he knew that the bullets would not work, that they would slide harmlessly through the chamber, beyond reach to the firing pin.

"If that shakes you up," Greg said to his frightened friends as he slipped one of the bullets into a firing chamber of the cylinder, "this ought to blow your mind."

He pointed the gun at his head and pulled the trigger.

Greg's grandmother was in the kitchen, baking the boys a cake.

Greg's grandfather was outside working on the roof. When Hugh Alexander heard the noise, he thought one of the boys had broken the big closet door mirror in his bedroom.

"I heard one of them say, 'Oh, my God, the blood,' and I thought they'd some how cut themselves," he recalled.

When Alexander rushed into the bedroom, he found his grandson lying on the carpet next to the bed, vomiting popcorn. Blood was spattered on the mirror, which was not broken after all.

"What happend," Alexander said, "was when he pointed the gun up that bullet slipped back (against the firing pin) like a mortar shell would, and he pulled the trigger and fired it."

Greg was pronounced dead 3½ hours later.

Six months later, Marjorie Alexander spends part of almost every day listening to a tape recording of an adolescent boy, accompanied by an amateur piano player, singing in a husky voice, "I'm in love, I'm all shook up. . . ."

"Greg was one of the most important things in my lifetime," she sobs.

On a shelf in Mrs. Alexander's bedroom closet, wrapped in cloth, is Charter Arms Undercover .38 Special Serial No. 490487, reclaimed from the Sheriff's Department.

"She wanted the gun back," explains Hugh Alexander. "She still wants to go shoot."

"I'd put it under lock and key," says Mrs. Alexander. "But there's no bullets to go with it now."

In the meantime, another grandchild has moved into Greg's old room. Joe's 16-year-old daughter, Elizabeth, now stays in the room across the hall from the Alexanders' bedroom.

Does the presence of that gun in the house worry Elizabeth's father in Utah?

"No, it doesn't," Joe says. "There's no more danger to her with the gun in the house than for her to walk to school or to the bus. . . . That gun isn't going to jump up and kill her. A person might."

[From the Los Angeles Times, Dec. 22, 1981]

A Month of Gun Death in L.A.

April was a moderate month. Only 80 people died in firearm homicides in Los Angeles County.

During an average month this year, 92 people were shot down countywide. In the first 10 months of the year, a total of 921 people died in gunfire homicides in Los Angeles County.

January was relatively mild, with only 75 such deaths. February and March were more deadly, each month claiming 91 people. The toll reached 92 in May, 87 in June, 99 in July, 100 in August, 95 in September and 111 in October.

So there was nothing extraordinary about the guns of April.

In many of the deaths that month, the motives for the killings were unclear.

In those cases in which the motives were known, the largest single category of victims was made up of the acquaintances, friends, relatives, lovers or spouses of the people who did the shooting. At least 21 victims died from bullets fired by people they knew or were related to.

Robberies also contributed to a large share of the killing in April. At least 18 people died during holdups. Two of the dead were suspected robbers shot by police. Another holdup man armed with a pellet gun was shot to death by a woman he tried to rob. Three citizens died in gunfire when they tried to shoot it out with robbers.

Gang-related shootings killed at least five.

Racially, the gunshot victims of April were made up of 27 whites, 26 Latinos, 25 black and two Asians.

There were 69 men and 11 women shot to death.

They died young. The largest cluster—30 victims—fell between the ages of 21 and 30.

The oldest person to die in April's gunfire was 70, the victim of a "mercy" killing. The youngest was 3 years old, allegedly shot to death by his teenage brother. A 12-year-old girl was killed, an innocent bystander in a gang shooting. Most of the deaths went unnoted by The Times or the nightly television news.●

S. 1692—THE VIEWS OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

● Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, soon after I was privileged to file with the Senate the report of the Committee on Environment and Public Works on S. 1692, the New York Times carried an editorial discussing this important bill.

S. 1692 is now pending on the Senates Calendar. I urge that each Member examine this new approach, a compromise approach, with care. In particular, I hope that they will read the committee's detailed analysis of the bill and its impact, contained in Senate Report 97-301. That committee report explains the pressures and justifications for the bill; it explains exactly what the bill does, and what it does not do.

As I believe the views of the Times are important to the Senate's understanding of this legislation, I ask that the New York Times editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 23, 1981]

Making Coal Pay for Itself

There's hardly a port in the United States that doesn't hope to profit from coal exports. To qualify as a coal port, however, a harbor must accommodate ships drawing 50 feet of water, a prescription that no American port now fills. The cost of meeting that standard can run $300 million per port. Who should pay?

Under a system as old as the Republic, main port channels have been dredged and turning basins have been created and maintained entirely at Federal expense. While coal ports wait for handouts, the Reagan Administration vows to advance no more port development money unless it will be repaid. Result: coal port preparation stands still.

A controversial bill sponsored by Senators Abdnor of South Dakota and Moynihan of New York would change the system. As reported out by a Senate subcommittee, it merits support.

The bill would split channel deepening from maintenance. Deepening would be paid for by the local agency in charge of the port, probably by borrowing. To repay it, shipowners would be charged for using channels in proportion to the benefits they derive. The Federal Government would continue to pay half the cost of maintaining new channels; user fees also would cover the local half of channel maintenance costs.

The bill 's controversial mainly because it makes interested parties pay for what they're accustomed to getting free. But the apparent no-cost aspect of channel improvements has encouraged an unrealistic number of ports to wait with the Crops of Engineers judges the merits of each proposal. The principle of first come, first served does nothing to assure that dollars go where they will accomplish most.

The harbor improvement bill would substitute a market test, to obtain financing for deep-channel projects, ports would have to demonstrate to bankers and bond buyers that they can attract the shipping needed to user fees big enough to repay their borrowings. No port can make such a demonstration unless it is also able to show that it has the needed land transport, loading capacity, wharves and service facilities.

Small and upriver ports, whose channel maintenance costs are higher, call the new approach discriminatory. But there's nothing intrinsically wrong with a system that would allow market forces to decide which ports can best handle the coal trade without wasting Federal dollars. The nation has a big stake in stimulating coal production and exports, but squandering the needed funds would benefit no American city.●

UNFAIR TRADING PRACTICES OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

● Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, American agriculture is becoming increasingly impatient with the continuing unfair trading practices of the European Economic Community.

When the administration took office 1 year ago, representaives of the EEC. responded to President Reagan's strong support for freer world trade by claiming that restraints were being considered on their export subsidy practices.

Last fall, however, it seems that proponents of the view that the common agricultural policy is bankrupting the Community lost the argument to those who favored business as usual. No production quotas on wheat, barley, sugar, or dairy products were approved. Instead, intervention prices were raised, and the target prices which determine the level of variable import levies were raised even more.

The only conclusion possible from these actions is that the EEC is gearing up for an even larger export program, and intends to raise more revenues to finance sales through taxing U.S. farm imports.

Mr. President, the lack of progress in bringing the European Community's subsidy practices under control is causing tremendous damage to U.S. farmers at a time when they can ill afford the loss of additional world markets.

In this regard, I have received a copy of a letter to the President from the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives (NCFC), cosigned by 43 other farm, commodity, and trade organizations, asking for continued vigorous insistence by the administration on an end to excessive EEC dumping of agricultural surpluses. I would ask, Mr. President, that the text of this letter and the press release issued by the NCFC be made a part of the Record at this point in my statement.

The material follows:

National Council of
Farmer Cooperatives,
Washington, D.C., January 12, 1982.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The undersigned organizations represent a broad cross-section of American agriculture, including producers, processors and exporters of agricultural products. On behalf of American agriculture, we commend you for your strong support in our efforts to eliminate the unfair world trade competition which we face from European and other export subsidies for agricultural products. We urge you and all trade leaders involved in such activity to intensify your efforts toward that goal.

Agriculture is vital to the American economy. Farm products directly and indirectly account for about 20 percent of our gross national product and about 23 million jobs. About 35,000 domestic jobs are created for every $1 billion in agricultural exports. This fiscal year agricultural exports are expected to reach $45 billion. Our agricultural trade surplus should reach $28 billion. If it were not for this large trade surplus in agricultural products, our country's balance of trade would be in far worse shape than it already is.

. United States agricultural trade has grown rapidly for one main reason: American farmers are the world's most efficient. When U.S. agricultural producers and processors are allowed to compete freely in world markets, we do well.

Unfortunately, the E.C. and in some cases other major world trading nations, have over the years adopted policies which often caused a critical loss of U.S. exports of agricultural products to important world markets. First, the E.C. erected trade barriers to keep out many U.S. exports from E.C., markets. Not content to restrict U.S. exports to the E.C., the community subsidizes agricultural exports to many third country markets. The U.S. is facing subsidized competition on wheat, wheat flour, poultry, fruit and vegetable products, meat products and many other primary or processed agricultural products. In 1980 alone, these subsidies exceeded $6.5 billion, and 1981 appropriation levels show no evidence of any reduction. Heavy export subsidies have resulted in lost markets for U.S. producers. At the same time they have distorted prices both in the U.S. market and abroad.

Billions of dollars in American export trade have already been lost as a result of E.C. subsidies. With ever growing subsidy expenditures, the E.C. threatens to unfairly deprive American exporters of their present market shares.

The United States does have recourse against these unfair subsidies. Many of the E.C. export subsidies for agricultural products violate international agreements, particularly the Subsidies Code of the recently concluded Multilateral Trade Negotiations. These agreements remain the cornerstone of an open international trading system. They must be enforced. Several agricultural trade associations have petitioned the United States Trade Representative requesting formal action by the U.S. government against these unfair E.C. subsidies. In congressional testimony, Ambassador William Brock has indicated that if the U.S. is unable to settle problems of export subsidies of E.C. agricultural products "we intend to use the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) Subsidies Code to bring our complaints before international review." Agriculture Secretary John Block and Assistant Secretary of State Robert Hormats have also expressed strong concern about E.C. export subsidies.

We are encouraged by your Administration's expressions of concern. But, Mr. President, we are also mindful that, although previous Administrations expressed concerns about these issues, they provided little results. Time after time U.S. negotiators have come home empty handed from consultations or disputes with the E.C. We hope that this situation will change under your Administration and that negotiators from your administration will have the necessary commitment and determination to enforce the international rules of trade established in the MTN.

We appreciate the difficulties of obtaining satisfactory and prompt relief, but we urge that your Administration's increasing efforts of recent weeks be stepped up even further. We seek the elimination of agricultural export subsidies which are in violation of international agreements. We urge you and your trade negotiators to continue to give highest priority to efforts to do away with such subsidies. For the United States to continue to allow its competitors to massively subsidise their exports is to accelerate the artificial undercutting of the competitive edge that U.S. agriculture has worked so hard to develop, and to allow a serious and a growing threat to international political as well as economic stability. Your commitment to long-term stability of both domestic and international markets is vital if U.S agriculture and our nation's economy is to gain from the agricultural trade benefits which hard work and ingenuity have brought us.

We pledge to do all we can to support you in your efforts to eliminate these unfair subsidies. Only by intensive and consistent efforts by you, your Administration and other national trade leaders can freer and fairer trade by restored to the benefit of our agriculture, our nation, and the worlds economic and political welfare.

Sincerely yours,

SIGNATURES

American Meat Institute.
American Soybean Association.
American Sugar Beet Growers Association.
American Sugar Cane League.
American Tobacco Association.
California-Arizona Citrus League.
California Dried Fruit Export Association.
California Grape and Tree Fruit League.
California League of Food Processors.
Cling Peach Advisory Board.
Cranberry Institute.
DFA of California.
Florida Citrus Mutual.
Florida Department of Citrus.
Florida Sugar Cane League.
International Apply Institute.
Michigan Association of Cherry Producers.
Millers' National Federation.
National Association of State Departments of Agriculture.
National Association of Wheat Growers.
National Broiler Council.
National Cattlemen's Association.
National Corn Growers Association.
National Cotton Council of America.
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.
National Food Processors Association.
National Forest Products Association.
National Grange.
National Grain and Feed Association.
National Grain Trade Council.
National Meat Association.
National Meat Canners Association.
National Pork Producers Council.
National Red Cherry Institute.
National Soybean Processors Association.
National Turkey Federation.
North American Export Grain Association.
Northwest Horticultural Council.
Poultry and Egg Institute of America.
Protein Grain Products International.
Rice Millers' Association.
United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association.
U.S. Feed Grains Council.
U.S. Wheat Associates.

FARM GROUPS WARN PRESIDENT OF GROWING EXPORT SUBSIDY THREATS

WASHINGTON, D.C., Jan. 12.—The National Council of Farmers Cooperatives (NCFC) and 43 other major agricultural organizations today warned President Reagan of growing export subsidy threats faced by U.S. farm and food exporters.

In a letter to the President, the group expressed appreciation for the Administration's aggressive efforts and progress in dealing with these threats, and appealed for continuance of stronger actions which would help eliminate unfair world trade competition faced by agricultural exporters. The group stressed their special concerns over the growing tendency of the European Community to use export subsidies in ways which seriously threaten established U.S. export markets.

NCFC Vice President Robert N. Hampton expressed further concern about these and other unfair practices faced by U.S. farmers in world markets. He called specical attention to 1) Limited access to Japanese markets for U.S. citrus, meat, and other products; and 2) The European Community's preferential and discriminatory treatment of Mediterranean and other products, which have seriously restricted many European market opportunities for U.S. farmers and exporters.

We're not telling the Europeans what their domestic programs should be, nor are we denying their need for a common agricultural policy," said Hampton. "But we are emphasizing long-standing U.S. agricultural concern over growing EC efforts to transfer costs of their internal programs to their world trading partners."

The ad hoc trade coalition, in calling for more open and fairer trade, said U.S. agriculture accounts for about 23 million U.S. jobs and 20 percent of our gross national product. Every $1 billion in agricultural exports is estimated to create some 35,000 domestic jobs, and the U.S. agriculture trade surplus is expected to reach about $28 billion in 1982.

The joint letter noted that if the U.S. allowed its competitors to strongly subsidize their exports, it would accelerate erosion of the competitive edge U.S. agriculture has worked so hard to develop.

Continued massive export subsidies by U.S. trade competitors were also seen as a serious and growing threat to international political and economic stability.

The agricultural trade group concluded by telling Reagan that his commitment to long-term stability of domestic and international markets is vital if U.S. agriculture, and the nation's economy, is to gain from agricultural trade benefits which hard work and ingenuity have brought us.

Co-signing the letter were: American Meat Institute, American Soybean Association, American Sugar Beet Growers Association, American Sugar Cane League, American Tobacco Association, California-Arizona Citrus League, California Dried Fruit Export Association, California Grape & Tree Fruit League, California League of Food Processors, Cling Peach Advisory Board, Dried Fruit Association of California, Florida Citrus Mutual, Florida Department of Citrus, Florida Sugar Can League, International Apple Institute, Michigan Association of Cherry Producers, Millers' National Federation, National Association of State Departments of Agriculture, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Broiler Council, National Cattlemen's Association, National Corn Growers Association, and National Cotton Council of America.

Also: National Food Processors Association, National Forest Products Association, National Grange, National Grain & Feed Association, National Grain Trade Council, National Meat Association, National Meat Canners Association, National Pork Producers Council, National Red Cherry Institute, National Soybean Processors Association, National Turkey Federation, North American Export Grain Association, Northwest Horticultural Council, Poultry and Egg Institute of America, Protein Grain Products International, Rice Millers' Association, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Associtaion, U.S. Feed Grains Council, U.S. Wheat Associates and Cranberry Institute.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative has before it a number of complaints under section 301 of the 1974 Trade Act against the export subsidy program of the European Economic Community.

During hearings next month scheduled by the International Trade Subcommittee of the Finance Committee chaired by Senator DANFORTH, officials of the Trade Representatives Office will be asked to review progress in considering prosecuting these 301 complaints.

In addition, high-ranking officials of the European Community's Commission will be in Washington next week to hold a further round of talks on our trade differences.

I would hope, Mr. President, that the repeated warnings by administration officials and by various Members of Congress on the export subsidy issue have been clearly understood, and that the EEC is preparing to enter negotiations on how the predatory aspects of their agricultural policy can be altered.

I would also hope that the EEC will not resort to threats against the free entry of soybean products and corn gluten feed into the Community in an effort to forestall our determination that changes be made.

American farmers and their representatives in Washington are asking for no more than their rights under the various international agreements currently in effect.

We expect our European counterparts to ask for the same and no more.●

SITUATION IN EL SALVADOR

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned over reports that the Reagan administration is preparing a Presidential certification to enable it to continue its military and economic assistance to El Salvador. Last year the Congress expressed its reservations about a policy which emphasized a military solution and failed to take positive actions to encourage a medicated political solution that would encompass all the parties in the fighting in El Salvador.

The Congress set several requirements which the President must consider if he wished to continue aid. Among these was that the Government of El Salvador "is making a concerted and significant effort to comply with internationally recognized human rights" and "is achieving substantial control over all elements of its own armed forces, so as to bring an end to indiscriminate torture and murder of Salvadoran citizens by these forces."

The reports coming out of El Salvador today indicate that the tragic situation in that small country continues to deteriorate.

On January 27 the Washington Post published an article describing an attack by government troops on a rural village in Morazan province, an attack which virtually wiped out an entire village. This can hardly be described as the "substantial control" of its armed forces called for by the Congress. Amnesty International has issued a new report describing the ongoing violations of human rights in El Salvador. In addition, I call to the Senate's attention another article from the Washington Post on January 25 on the land reform program. This much heralded economic program appears to be floundering to no small degree as a result of indiscriminate actions by Salvadoran military and paramilitary forces against the rural population. I shall submit the text of these items at the close of my remarks.

In conclusion, I strongly urge the administration to reconsider its policy toward El Salvador and direct its efforts toward reaching a mediated political solution that can bring a just and lasting peace to that war-torn country.

The material follows:

SALVADORAN PEASANTS DESCRIBE MASS KILLING

(By Alma Guillermoprieto)

MOZOTE, EL SALVADOR, January 14 (delayed).—Several hundred civilians, including women and children, were taken from their homes in and around this village and killed by Salvadoran Army troops during a December offensive against leftist guerrillas, according to three survivors who say they witnessed the alleged massacres.

Reporters taken to tour the region and speak to the survivors by guerrilla soldiers, who control large areas of Morazan Province, were shown the rubble of scores of adobe houses they and the survivors said were destroyed by the troops in the now deserted village community. Dozens of decomposing bodies still were seen beneath the rubble and lying in nearby fields, despite the month that has passed since the incident.

[In Washington, Salvadoran Ambassador Ernesto Rivas Gallont said, "I reject emphatically that the Army of El Salvador" was engaged in "killing women and children. It is not within the armed institutions' philosophy to act like that." He acknowledged that the "armed forces have been active in that part of the country," particularly during a December offensive against the guerrillas, but said that their actions had "definitely not been against the civilian populations."]

The survivors, including a woman who said her husband and four of her six children were killed, maintained that no battle was under way during the second week in December when the alleged massacre took place.

The woman, Rufina Amaya, a 38-year-old housewife, said that the troops entered the village one morning and, after herding the residents into two separate groups—men divided from women and children—took them off and shot them. Amaya said she had hidden during the shooting and later escaped to the guerrilla-protected camp where she was interviewed.

At the same time, troops allegedly spread into the nearby countryside and smaller surrounding villages. Jose Marcial Martinez, 14, from nearby La Joya, said he had hidden in a cornfield and watched his parents, brothers and sisters killed. Jose Santos, 15, said he had witnessed the similar slaying of his parents, three younger brothers and two grandparents.

A dozen other persons from the area interviewed by this correspondent said they had fled their homes during the December offensive and claimed to have lost family members in the military assault.

To reach the heart of Morazan Province from the north, it is necessary to walk for several days, passing through villages and guerrilla camps. After several months of requests, the Farabundo Marti Liberation Front agreed to take this correspondent into the province in early January, two weeks after the guerrillas' clandestine radio station first reported the alleged massacres in Morazan. It was clear that the guerrillas' purpose was not only to demonstrate to journalists their control of the region, but also to provide what they said was evidence of the alleged massacre in December.

As we neared Mozote, the group of young guerrillas who were my guides and I passed on foot through the village of Arambala, whose pretty, whitewashed adobe houses appeared to have been looted of all contents. The village was deserted.

About 45 minutes farther down the road, we entered another small town. Here the houses also were gutted and looted, but the overwhelming initial impression was of the sickly sweet smell of decomposing bodies. This was Mozote.

The muchachos [boys], as the guerrillas are called, walked us toward the central square where the ruins of what had been a small, whitewashed church stood. The walls of the smaller sacristy beside it also appeared to have had its adobe walls pushed in. Inside, the stench was overpowering, and countless bits of bones—skulls, rib cages, femurs, a spinal column—poked out of the rubble.

The 15 houses on the main village street had been smashed. In two of them, as in the sacristy, the rubble was filled with bones. All of the buildings, including the three in which body parts could be seen, appeared to have been set on fire, and the remains of the people were as charred as the remaining beams.

Several small rural roads led away from the village to other groups of houses that collectively are known as the Mozote community. We walked down one, an idyllic path where every house had a grove of fruit trees, a small chicken pen and at least one beehive. Only the fruit trees were intact; the hives were overturned, the bees buzzing everywhere. The houses were destroyed and looted.

The road was littered with animal corpses, cows and horses. In the cornfields behind the houses were more bodies, these unburned by fire but baked by the sun. In one grouping in a clearing in a field were 10 bodies: two elderly people, two children, one infant—a bullet hole in the head—in the arms of a woman, and the rest adults. Although local peasants later said they had buried some of the bodies in the area, the guerrilla youths acknowledged they had asked that the corpses be left until someone from the outside could be brought to see them.

It was getting dark, and we traveled to a guerrilla military encampment.

The camp was populated by about 20 young guerrillas, all armed and obviously under military discipline. Farther down the road was a civilian camp, like the other a collection of small adobe houses, with about 80 peasants, refugees and guerrilla sympathizers. It was from this camp the next morning that the guerrillas sent for Amaya, who said she was the only survivor she knew of from Mozote.

The guerrillas left me alone to talk to her. She said that it was on the evening of Dec. 11, although she spoke more of days of the week than dates, that troops of the Atlacatl Brigade had come to Mozote. The brigade is an elite, 1,000-man unit of the Salvadoran Army, well known at least by name to most

Salvadorans, that has been trained for rapid deployment and antiguerrilla offensives by U.S. military advisers here.

"The Army people had warned Marcos Diaz, a friend of theirs from our village, that an offensive was coming and that there would be no more traffic allowed from San Francisco Gotera [the provincial capital] in December and that we should all stay in Mozote where no one would harm us. So we did. There were about 500 of us in all living in the village."

The soldiers, she said, took those villagers who were in their homes and made them stand outside "in the road for about 1½ hours. They took our money, searched the houses, ate our food, asked us where the guns were and went away. We were happy then. 'The repression is over,' we said. They didn't kill anybody."

Amaya spoke with what appeared to be controlled hysteria. During our conversation, she broke down only when speaking of what she said were the deaths of her children. She said that while her two surviving sons have joined the guerrillas since the December incident, Mozote was not predominantly proguerrilla, although it is in the heart of a rebel zone.

She said the guerrillas had gone around the villages in early December warning the population of an impending government offensive and instructing civilians to head for towns and refugee camps outside the area.

"But because we knew the Army people, we felt safe," she said. Her husband, who Amaya said was on very good terms with the local military, "had a military safe conduct."

At around 5:30 the morning after their initial visit, she said, the troops, headed by the same officer she called Lt. Ortega, returned to Mozote. She said they herded the people into the tiny village square in front of the chruch, men in one line and women and children in another.

"Marcos Diaz, who had been told by the Army we would be safe, and my husband were in the men's line. I counted about 80 men and 90 women not including the children."

She said the women were herded with their children into a house on the square. From there they saw the men being blindfolded and bound, kicked and thrown against each other, then taken away in groups of four and shot.

"The soldiers had no fury," she said. "They just observed the lieutenant's orders. They were cold. It wasn't a battle."

"Around noon they began with the women. First they picked out the young girls and took them away to the hills. Then they picked out the old women and took then to Israel Marquez's house on the square. We heard the shots there. Then they started with us in groups. When my turn came and I was being led away to Israel Marquez's house I slipped behind a tree and climbed up. I saw the lieutenant then. He was personally machine-gunning people."

"I heard the soldiers talking," she continued tonelessly. "An order arrived from a Lt. Caceres to Lt. Ortega to go ahead an kill the children too. A soldier said, 'Lieutenant sombody here says he won't kill children.' 'Who's the sonofabitch who said that?' the lieutenant answered. 'I am going to kill him.' I could hear them shouting from where I was crouching in the tree.

"I could hear the children crying. I heard my own children. When it was all over late at night the lieutenant ordered the soldiers to put a torch to the corpses. There was a great fire in the night."

Amaya said she escaped while the fire was still burning. "I heard the soldiers say 'Let's go. Witches could come out of the fire.' Then they left to go on what they called a 'combing operation' in the houses on the hills. I started walking and walked for three nights. In the daytime I hid because there were troops everywhere."

Amaya, as well as the two boys who said they witnessed their familes being killed, emphasized that the troops appeared to be in regular radio contact with someone.

I later saw Amaya in the civilian camp down the road, where I also met the two boys. Although they were the only ones who claimed to have witnessed the killing, nearly everyone in the camp said they had come there because of "the repression in December" and claimed to have lost members of their families.

[In Washington, Ambassador Rivas, in denying the accuracy of this account Tuesday, said that "serious efforts" were being made to stem armed forces abuses and that this was the "type of story that leads us to believe there is a plan" to discredit the ongoing electoral process in El Salvador, and to discredit the armed forces "or to take credit away from the certification President Reagan must make to Congress."

[This week the Reagan administration must by law certify to Congress that the Salvadoran leadership "is achieving substantial control over all elements of its own armed forces, so as to bring to an end the indiscriminate tortune and murder of Salvadoran citizens by these forces," or risk a cutoff of aid to El Salvador under congressional restrictions.]

Compiling the Body Count

(By John Dinges)

San Salvador.—A political officer in the fortress-like U.S. embassy here last week bent over charts and graphs mapping statistics he had meticulously culled from Salvadoran newspapers for the past 15 months.

Two blocks away a Salvadoran too fearful to tell a visitor his name showed long lists of names and other information written in cramped longhand in red ink.

In the throes of El Salvador's 2-year-old rampage of political violence and civil war, the two men are compiling the country's most politically crucial statistic: the body county of noncombatant civilians.

By anyone's count, the numbers are horrifying. The lowest calculation is the U.S. Embassy's 7,732 people killed since the embassy began to keep track in September 1980.

The highest estimate was reported by Salvadoran Defense Minister Gen. Jose Guillermo Garcia, who told local newpapers two months ago that the violence had claimed 30,000 victims since 1979—24,700 of them "people who had nothing to do with the conflict."

At stake in the reporting of the deaths is more than the numbers themselves. Each side in the political struggle wracking the country has blamed the other for most of the brutality. The documentation of the deaths and their circumstances, along with the methods and sources employed by those compiling the statistics form the basis for answering the question of who bears most of the blame.

Garcia's figures for civilians, which were announced without elaboration, are on the same order of magnitude as the findings of the Catholic Archdiocese of San Salvador's Legal Aid Office—8,062 in 1980 and 13,353 last year—and the Jesuit-run Central American University calculation of 12,500 and 13,500 in those two years.

According to these estimates, at least one of every 215 people has been killed in this country of 4.6 million since the escalation of violence following an October 1979, military coup.

The task of assigning responsibility to one side or the other has been so fraught with political implications that many news reports have resorted simply to citing the estimates and attributing the deaths to undefined "political violence" of the left and the right.

Not so the compilers. The archdiocese's Legal Aid Office, in its "Statistical Balance of the Repression," attributes 60 percent of the deaths to joint actions of the Army and security forces and 35 percent to "unidentified paramilitary gangs" of the right. There is no category for victims of leftist violence—a deficiency that has evoked criticism of the office by San Salvador's Bishop Arturo Rivera y Damas.

The university's Documentation and Information Center concluded that there is reliable evidence pointing to what group was responsible in only 30 to 40 percent of the cases of civilian murders. Of those cases, the center found that four out of five were killed by the government forces and rightist gangs working with the acquiescence of the military.

The confidential U.S. Embassy report, a copy of which was obtained with embassy authorization, is a compilation of the weekly cable to Washington on violence, nicknamed the "grim-gram." The report found that responsibility could be reasonably determined in about 29 percent of cases, with government forces responsible for 46 percent, rightist "terrorists" 7 percent, and leftist "terrorists" 47 percent.

The embassy report, which officials said is based entirely on information published in the San Salvador press, comments that "responsibility for the overwhelming number of deaths that occur here is never legally determined nor usually ever accounted for by reasonably clear and coherent published evidence."

While contending that "El Salvador's tangled web of attack and vengeance, traditional criminal violence and political mayhem" make it impossible to sustain the charges that the government security forces are the "primary agents of murder here," the report adds that there is "no attempt to lighten the responsibility for the deaths of many hundreds and perhaps thousands which can be attributed to the security forces."

The report found an "encouraging . . . decrease" in violence for the September 1980 to September 1981 period that is the main body of the survey, but the official said that the level of violence jumped sharply again in November and December and has continued upward in January.

The embassy findings are a significant departure from charges frequently made by officials of the Reagan administration over the past year that the overwhelming majority of the civilians have been killed by leftist guerrillas. In congressional hearings last February, John Bushnell, then the acting assistant secretary of state for Latin America, charged that guerrillas were responsible for 6,000 of a total of 10,000 deaths reported up to that time.

Bushnell said his figures were based on "public announcements" of the leftist guerrilla groups. The guerrillas have denied they had made such announcements, and human rights organizations disputed the U.S. figure.

The Salvadoran civilian-military junta also has claimed that the left is responsible for most of the killing, but has not made public any statistics to back up its case. Junta member Jose Antonio Morales Ehrlich said in an interview that his government is new and does not have the "financial means" to organize a human rights program to document the violence.

Those blaming the government forces, he said, were operating from a "naive" and "romantic" concept of human rights or had been fooled by "disinformation of the Soviet Union."

He said that even in cases in which civilians were killed by government forces, guerrillas were ultimately responsible because they had started the killing first and provoked the military reaction.

A human rights worker who asked to remain anonymous said that the evidence pointing to the military and allied paramilitary groups as primarily responsible was "not just circumstantial," but neither could it be totally conclusive. The worker said that gathering information about killings beyond local newspaper accounts was extremely difficult and dangerous because it involved compiling personal testimony from survivors or witnesses, then protecting the sources from reprisals.

Some Legal Aid Office statements on the violence and its causes several months ago were severely criticized as politically biased by acting Archbishop Rivera y Damas because of their failure to report violence by the left and for making strongly political statements against the government.

A high official in the archdiocese said the criticisms were directed "at their political statements, not at the quality of their investigation." He said the church continued to regard the documentation of the body count as "scrupulous," although clearly not impartial in its omission of leftist violence.

Legal Aid workers declined to explain the methodology of their studies except to say that they had obtained personal testimony for every body counted. Other sources said the office has workers stationed in cities all around the country to compile data.

The embassy report, since it is based exclusively on newspaper reports, provides a minimum figure for the killing. The embassy official acknowledged its limitations. The study excludes from its compilations deaths classified as casualties in military action, he said. But the official said that guerrilla attacks are not considered military action but rather "terrorism" and therefore any resulting deaths are counted as civilians killed by the left.

The study's definition of military action is limited to offensives initiated by government forces, and resulting deaths are considered combat casualties. The embassy study does not include in its count any civilians killed as a result of government combat actions.

[Prepared by Amnesty International, January 1982]

CURRENT ASSESSMENT OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN EL SALVADOR

According to recent reports reaching Amnesty International, torture, "disappearances," and extrajudicial executions continue in El Salvador at an alarming rate. Amnesty International remains gravely concerned at human rights violations including the torture and summary execution of prisoners and suspected political opponents and the "disappearance" and probable murder of many thousands of individuals including those involved in monitoring and defending human rights, peasants and refugees, academics, trade unionists, the clergy, the wounded, medical personnel, first aid workers and the young.

A systematic and brutal policy of government-sponsored intimidation and repression has characterized the past year in El Salvador. People from all sectors of Salvadoran society have been detained without warrant, "disappeared" and been tortured or murdered. Among the reported atrocities have been dismemberments, including children being slashed to death with machetes and decapitated, strangulations, massive bombings and summary executions of internal refugees and displaced persons. Methods of torture while in detention have included the use of electric shock, beatings, the use of sulphuric acid resulting in scorched flesh on portions of the body and the use of hallucinogenic drugs.

It is Amnesty International's considered opinion, after reviewing hundreds of detailed accounts reaching our organization, that in the majority of the reported cases, official security forces have been implicated and that these human rights violations have occurred on such a massive scale that they constitute a gross and consistent pattern of human rights abuses. Testimony received by Amnesty International implicates all branches of the Salvadoran security forces whether nominally military, military police or paramilitary in human rights abuses aimed at civilian members of the population who had no part in guerrilla activity. Sources of information supporting this conclusion have included missions of investigation and observation to the region, including those carried out by Amnesty International as well as other organizations, data provided by Salvadoran human rights and church organizations, foreign and Salvadoran journalists and personal testimonies and reports issued by a wide variety of organizations which have recently visited the country.

During the month of January 1982, Amnesty International has received numerous reports of abductions by security forces in El Salvador. Among those are the following representative cases of grave concern to Amnesty International:

On January 13, 1982, Luis Villalobos Huezo, age 33, was abducted while in his father's printing shop in San Salvador. Luis had been one of several witnesses to the arrest of his father, Luis Villalobos, two days earlier by members of the National Guard. It has been suggested that the reason for his arrest is that one of his sons is reported to have been actively opposed to the present government. Authorities have denied his detention and there are grave concerns for his safety.

Flora de Maria Velasco, a maid, age 18 and five months pregnant, "disappeared" on January 5, 1982 at 11:00 p.m. She was abducted along with her husband, Julio Cesar Monterrosa, a 27 year old music teacher, and her brother-in-law, Gilberto Monterrosa, a student. The three were abducted from Colonia America in San Salvador by members of the National Guard and are believed to be held in the National Guard headquarters in San Salvador.

Also on January [illegible] Rudy Leonel Alvarez, age 20, a worker, was detained in San Antonio Abad, San Salvador, by civilian-dressed men believed by eye-witnesses to be members of the security forces.

On December 10-13, 1981, according to sources in El Salvador, many hundreds of men, women and children were reportedly killed by the army in the department of Morazan.

In late December 1981, Amnesty International issued appeals on behalf of 55 individuals arrested by members of the Salvadoran security forces between October 7-December 13. The detention of these individuals has not been acknowledged by Salvadoran authorities and there are grave fears for their safety. Among those detained were:

Aida Telma Murcia, a baker, age 34, detained on December 2, in her bakery in Colonia Santa Carlota, San Salvador, by members of the security forces in plain clothes.

Manfredo Cesar Henriquez Flores, a student, age 22, detained by the army on December 1 as he was playing basketball in the Domingo Sabio sportsfield in San Salvador.

Pedro Aguilar Urrutia, a student, age 13, detained without charge on November 17 by members of the plain clothes security forces at his home in Canton Miramar, Comasagua.

Jose Victor Ramirez, a 67 year old sacristan, detained on November 6 by members of the plain clothes security forces in the El Carmen church in Santa Tecla.

Guadelupe del Carmen Brizuela de Avila, a student, age 15, detained on October 16 by army in her home in San Salvador. A writ of habeas corpus has been granted in the Supreme Court but the authorities deny that she is in detention.

Aguilas Ingles Echeverria, a 32 year old secondary school teacher detained on November 26 at the entrance to the General Fransisco Menendez Institute by army troops.

In the course of compiling this list, Amnesty International received information on eleven additional individuals who had been arbitrarily detained by security forces during this same period. The detention of these eleven people has not been acknowledged by Salvadoran authorities.

It should be noted that the cases highlighted here reflect only a small percentage of the volume of daily reports brought to the attention of Amnesty International and include only a fraction of the cases on which Amnesty International has initiated appeals.

To the knowledge of Amnesty International, no satisfactory or genuine investigation has been conducted into the thousands of cases of human rights violations in which security force involvement has been alleged.

For example, today, more than one year after the death of four North American church women, no convictions have been obtained nor has the Government of El Salvador effectively investigated the situation. This example is only one instance, albeit the one most familiar to U.S. citizens, of the failure of the Salavadoran Government to investigate human rights abuses for which their security forces are allegedly responsible.

Another case in which an investigation has been promised by Salvadoran authorities involved the death of some eighty-three children and young people whose decapitated bodies were found in August 1981 in Santa Ana. Shortly after the incident, the Minister of Defense had publicly promised an inquiry, but according to Amnesty International's knowledge, no satisfactory investigation has taken place.

These cases are only two in a series of cases that illustrate a consistent pattern of failure by the Government of El Salvador to act upon reports implicating security forces in human rights violations or to bring those responsible to justice.

Amnesty International is aware that these violations of human rights have occurred at a time of continuing civil conflict between guerrilla groups and government forces and is also aware of reports of abuses having been committed by non-governmental forces. In some cases the government has attributed the deaths to murder by unofficial extremist groups of both the left and the right, thus abbrogating all governmental responsibility for the killings. In other cases, the authorities have stated that victims died in confrontations between guerrilla groups and government forces. However, analysis of a large number of incidents has led Amnesty International to conclude that there has been a consistent pattern of human rights violations, including torture, "disappearance," and coldblooded murder being carried out by Salvadoran security forces and directed against defenseless individuals not engaged in guerrilla activity.

In conclusion, Amnesty International continues to receive daily reports of violations of human rights directed against civilian members of the population. In January 1982, Archbishop Rivera y Damas (considered by then Secretary of State William P. Clark to be an authority on El Salvador in his June 1981 communication with Amnesty International) estimated that the non-combatant death toll during 1981 had reached 11,723 and put the number of individuals captured or detained at 1,808, figures which Amnesty International believes reinforce fears that there has been no improvement in the human rights situation in El Salvador in recent months. Amnesty International continues to be gravely concerned about human rights violations in El Salvador and continues to initiate appeals on behalf of the thousands of individuals who have been subjected to torture, "disappearance" and execution.

Amnesty International considers that where a government encourages or allows private persons or groups to commit acts which constitute abuses of human rights, that government remains responsible for such acts, by virtue of its willful failure to protect human rights to which it is committed by its own constitution, and by virtue of the regional and international conventions and standards to which it has subscribed, as well as by the rules of international law.

The security forces' involvement in massive human rights abuses is clearly in direct violation of internationally and regionally accepted standards for the protection of human rights as guaranteed under the Salvadoran Constitution, and as set out in such documents as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocal, and the American Convention on Human Rights.

SALVADORAN LAND REFORM IMPERILED, REPORT SAYS

(By Karen DeYoung)

Land-reform workers in El Salvador have charged that the reform program, strongly supported by the Reagan administration as a key to future Salvadoran democracy and stability, is near collapse because of military-backed terror and murder, illegal peasant evictions and a slow, "frequently hostile" bureaucracy.

In a December report requested by Salvadoran President Jose Napoleon Duarte, the executive board of the Union Comunal Salvadorena, the country's largest peasant organization and an indirect recipient of U.S. aid for educational and advisory assistance to the program, said that "the failure of the agrarian reform process is an immediate and imminent danger."

Asked Friday about the report, the State Department dismissed the USC statistics as "not as a rule definitive or reliable" and characterized the land-reform program as "a remarkable success story."

The administration must certify to Congress this week that the Salvadoran government is "making continued progress in implementing" promised reforms, including land reform, or risk a cutoff of the $25 million in U.S. military aid and $40 million in economic assistance budgeted this year for El Salvador.

The congressional restrictions, which also require certification that El Salvador is making progress toward stemming human rights abuses and promoting a political rather than military solution to the country's civil war, were mandated last month in response to concern over administration backing for the Salvadoran leadership.

But background conversations with administration officials about questions raised both by the UCS report and a recently completed internal Agency for International Development audit of a $10 million U.S. aid project to assist the land reform, as well as an extensive response prepared for The Washington Post by U.S. Ambassador to El Salvador Deane R. Hinton, reflected a deep concern about the problems they pose for certification.

The audit, dated Dec. 17, 1981, notes "progress" in the project, but it cites serious difficulties in monitoring the distribution of U.S. funds. It notes that AID recieves information on the reform only through government meetings and written reports, with no field work of its own because of security problems.

While the congressional restrictions on aid contain no provision for rejecting administration certification, the House subcommittee on inter-American affairs, chaired by Rep. Michael Barnes (D-Md.), has scheduled hearings to begin Feb. 3 on El Salvador.

Although Barnes said in an interview last week that he fully expects the certification to be made, he said the hearings were intended to allow the administration to justify it and to allow critics of U.S. and Salvadoran government policies to air their views. The UCS document is expected to be discussed in the hearings.

Land reform was decreed in early 1980, about six months after a group of reform-minded young military officers staged a successful coup against the last in a long line of rightist generals.

The land-reform program is divided into two operative parts, designed to benefit nearly one-fifth of El Salvador's 5.5 million people. It calls for government expropriation, with compensation, of more than 300 large agricultural estates to be turned over to peasant cooperatives, and the granting of ownership titles for small plots to as many as 125,000 sharecroppers and tenant farmers.

Land redistribution, along with other political and economic reforms promised by the new government and supported by the United States, was considered vital to satisfy the aspirations of El Salvador's majority peasant class and to counter appeals to them by the left, which argued that revolution was the only way to alter permanently the status quo. The reforms have been bitterly opposed by the conservative Salvadoran business community, and the large landowners for whom the rightist military historically ruled the country.

The Reagan administration has continued its predecessor's support for the reforms, while stepping up military aid to help the government in its year-old civil war with leftist guerrillas. It does not dispute that there are serious problems with the land-reform program, many of which it blames on bureaucratic inefficiency and the size of the task.

However, while it acknowledges a lack of control over elements of the military by civilians who now share power with the Army, it contends that the government is gradually bringing these elements to heel. In the administration's view, the bulk of the problems are caused by the guerrillas, who it charges are sabotaging the reforms and killing more civilians than the military.

While economic aid is necessary to promote the reforms, the administration argues, the defeat of the guerrillas is vital if the reforms are to succeed.

Critics of U.S. policy, including a number of members of Congress, long have maintained the opposite. They charge that despite the good intentions of some in the Salvandoran government, the reforms are being thwarted by rightists in the same military that is pledged to implement them and the wealthy who want to return to the status quo. This situation, they maintain, is merely perpetuated by U.S. military aid.

A copy of the critical UCS report, which is dated Dec. 10, and covers events in 1981, was given to The Washington Post by Leonel Gomez, the former deputy director of the Salvadoran government agency charged with carrying out the land reform. Gomez, who now lives in Washington and publicly opposes U.S. policy in El Salvador, fled his country last January when agency director Rodolfo Viera, a former head of the UCS, was killed there with two American labor officials.

The State Department was given a copy of the report by the AFL-CIO-affiliated American Institute for Free Labor Development, which has worked in El Salvador since 1966, and helped found the UCS in 1968 as an association of peasant cooperatives.

According to the labor institute's deputy director, Sam Haddad, current UCS membership is about 110,000 peasants. In the past two years, the labor institute has received U.S. aid grants, this year totaling $1.5 million, which it uses to pay about 200 UCS officials and members to promote land reform and give technical assistance to its beneficiaries and to monitor implementation of the program in the countryside.

While he emphasized that the labor institute and the UCS are "still very supportive" of the land-reform concept, Haddad said "a lot of the things" in the UCS report "are true" and that the labor institute stands behind the documentation. Both the labor institute and Gomez, who requested that he be identified as having released the report to the press, expressed fear that newspaper publication of the charges in the report would place UCS officials in El Salvador in physical danger.

"I can see people down there . . . the extreme right . . . being most upset, and taking revenge, if it got out that the executive board of the UCS published this," the labor institute's assistant director, Jesse Friedman, said. The two Americans killed with Viera last January, Michael Hammer and Mark Pearlman, were employes of the institute. Two Salvadoran businessmen were arrested in connection with the deaths, but one has since been released.

Gomez maintained that UCS leaders were "risking their lives" by compiling the document, but said that "I don't talk about the 'extreme right.' I talk about the [Salvadoran] Army."

Among its specific allegations, the report says that "at least 90 officials" of peasant organizations, many of whose cases are detailed in one of several appendices to the report, and "a large number of beneficiaries" of the land reform "have died during 1981 at the hands of the ex-landlords and their allies, who are often members of the local security forces."

It says more than 25,000 former sharecroppers or tenants have been forcibly evicted from their farms, "in the majority of cases with the assistance of members of the military forces," before they could claim the ownership documents.

Using figures that generally agree with those of AID for the same period, the report notes that only about 15,000 families eligible for individual ownership have been granted provisional titles to their land.

Since the program began in April 1980, no permanent titles have been granted to individuals. Of more than 300 peasant cooperatives formed on former large, privately owned estates, only two have received title to the land. One more title was granted after the UCS report was compiled.

"What had begun in March and April of 1980 with bright promise, and had continued to show bright promise even through the end of 1980," an 11-page summary of the document concludes, "now threatens to become a nightmare of bureaucratic red tape, evictions and killings, in which it will soon be beyond the capacity of the government or the campesino [peasant] leadership to prevent a complete loss of faith by our country's campesinos in the agrarian reform program.

"If and when this happens, the extreme left will have free rein throughout the countryside and all prospects for ending the violence or instituting democracy will be at an end."

Ambassador Hinton disputed a number of the figures in the UCS report, described some as "unproven," and differed in interpretation of others.

"While the embassy does not deny that implementation of the agrarian reform can be improved," he said in a written response to questions transmitted to the State Department, "it is essential to view the reform within the context of violence and social upheaval taking place in El Salvador today."

Addressing specific points in the document, Hinton said that 20,000 provisional titles have been issued to sharecroppers and tenant farmers, covering 30 percent of what he said were 67,000 potential beneficiary families.

The State Department and AID, in previous documents and congressional testimony, consistently have calculated the number of potential beneficiaries as 125,000, the figure also used by UCS. The new figure of slightly more than half the original, Hinton said without elaboration, was due to "subsequent analysis based on the best available data."

Without addressing directly the delays in granting permanent titles to small-plot farmers, Hinton said "the important considerations, rather than estimates based on insufficient or dated statistics, is that the process is continuing and is doing so under conditions less than ideal."

Hinton said the titling of large cooperatives, with only three out of 326 farms completed so far, remained a "serious bottleneck and will continue to be unless major legal reforms are made of the entire registry process. The chances of this taking place in the immediate future are not likely."

Although the UCS and others have charged that the lack of titles raises the hopes, and spurs the actions, of those who hope to reverse the process, Hinton said that titling "is only one part of the agrarian reform process" and that the important thing is that the cooperatives are now in possession of the land, with or without titles.

On the question of evictions, Hinton said that in those provinces "not affected by the high levels of violence, little in the way of evictions has occurred and that generally but not always the armed forces are, within their own limited capacities, giving support to the entire agrarian-reform process including attempts to assist farmers who have been illegally evicted."

He said that killings of civilians have decreased in the past year, and that while they still occur, "the number is impossible to determine with any degree of accuracy." In general, human rights organizations monitoring the situation in El Salvador agree that, after a high level last winter and through the early spring, the number of deaths decreased through the summer. But listings by the University of Central America in San Salvador, among others, show an upswing beginning in October.

The labor institute maintains that the UCS report is accurate because of the organization's extensive field reporting. According to the AID internal audit of its assistance to land reform, "because of the political situation in El Salvador and the inadequate staffing," the AID office there confined its monitoring of the project to "periodic meetings with [government] officials and reviews of statistical reports." Field visits to projects, it says, "were discontinued due to dangerous conditions that existed in project areas."

The audit, which covers the period from July 7, 1980, to May 31, 1981, notes that "progress was being made in achieving the objectives." It goes on, however, to raise some serious questions about lack of technical assistance to cooperatives and of supervision over the spending of U.S. funds, including "about $872,000 of ineligible loan expenditures" reimbursed by AID in El Salvador.

AID officials in San Salvador said all the deficiencies pointed out in the audit had been corrected, but they declined to detail measures taken until they have been officially communicated to Washington.●

SOUTH DAKOTA WATER DEVELOPMENT

● **Mr. ABDNOR.** Mr. President, yesterday the South Dakota congressional delegation met to discuss strategy for action on S. 1553 and H.R. 4347, which we have all sponsored jointly to reauthorize the WEB pipeline project, to authorize feasibility studies of the CENDAK and Garrison extension irrigation proposals, and to reauthorize Missouri basin hydropower for certain South Dakota projects.

The Reagan administration has endorsed and pledged to work for enactment of the bill with amendments, and the South Dakota delegation is in agreement that our best hope for quick action is press for markup of the bill as endorsed by the administration. We have done so and will continue our joint and unified efforts to achieve the most rapid possible action.

While South Dakotans know that we are entitled to expect the Federal Government to honor fully its commitments to our State under the Pick-Sloan Missouri basin program, we recognize that the immediate provisions supported by the administration are the best we are likely to do at this difficult time in the economic history of our Nation. Indeed, the Reagan administration has gone the extra mile to see that justice is done for South Dakota; and, I for one, am deeply gratified.

To demonstrate the unanimity of our support for quick action on S. 1553 and H.R. 4347 as endorsed by the administration and to eliminate any confusion which may exist in that regard, the South Dakota delegation yesterday released a joint statement to the press, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION REGARDING UNIFICATION ON WATER LEGISLATION

The delegation remains totally committed to our support for S. 1553/H.R. 4347, which we have jointly sponsored.

Based upon our sacrifice of over 500,000 acres for the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, we believe that South Dakota is entitled to expect the federal government to live up to its commitment to our state to assist with water development. We recognize that the administration's support represents the best hope for quick action on our bill, however, and the delegation will continue to work for the enactment of legislation which includes reauthorization of the WEB pipeline, authorization of feasibility studies of CENDAK and extension of the Garrison Unit into South Dakota, and the provision of low-cost hydropower for the Grass Rope irrigation project.

We are in complete agreement that these provisions should be enacted. We are hopeful they will be enacted, and we are redoubling our joint and unified efforts to see that they are enacted.

In addition, we have written the Interior Department seeking documentation of the administration's intent to involve the Farmers Home Administration in administering WEB construction funding.

While the outlook for immediate funding for the completion of any of the proposed projects, including WEB, is dependent on the general state of the economy, we are all committed to seeking the earliest possible appropriation of funds to see these projects through completion.

Finally, to strengthen our individual, personal contacts with chairmen Frank Murkowski and Abraham Kazen of the respective subcommittees on water and power of the Senate and the House, we are sending them the following letter which we have jointly signed:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1982.

Hon. FRANK MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Immigration, Washington, D.C.

Hon. ABRAHAM KAZEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Longworth House Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK AND CHICK: You have both heard more from us than you would like with respect to S. 1553/H.R. 4347. Enactment of this measure is vital, however, and we hope that you will excuse our persistence in urging once again, jointly, as a delegation, that it be moved with all due haste.

As you know, the Administration has officially endorsed enactment of the bill with amendments. While we sincerely believe that our state is entitled to more even than would be provided by S. 1553/H.R. 4347 as introduced, especially the retention of favorable authorization criteria, we recognize that the provisions supported by the Administration are realistically the best we can get at this time. Consequently, we respectfully urge enactment of those provisions without delay.

There are several reasons for our sense of urgency:

First, the $1.9 million which was appropriated for the WEB project for fiscal year 1981 has been deferred until the project is reauthorized. It would be well to initiate construction of the intake structure while the level of Lake Oahe is low, yet a delay in the reauthorization could mean missing the 1982 construction schedule altogether.

Second, the urgency of the need for WEB has been recently re-emphasized by the failure of the water supply of the community of Roscoe, South Dakota. The community has been forced to haul water from neighboring towns, and the systems of other communities to be served by WEB could fail at any time as well.

Third, bids were so favorable on the Grass Rope irrigation project that the Department is considering accelerating completion of the project in fiscal year 1982 to take advantage of the cost savings available. The lack of clear-cut authority for Missouri Basin power will complicate development of the project and could result in needless expense to the Lower Brule Tribe.

Fourth, the Department is ready to proceed to the feasibility level with studies of CENDAK and extension of the Garrison Unit. The State of South Dakota is cooperating closely with the Department in these studies. In fact, Governor Janklow has proposed and the Legislature is expected to approve State funding for portions of the studies, and a delay in the study authorizations with prevent the Department from cooperating fully with the State in a timely fashion. A delay in the Garrison study could have the added effect of forcing the State to reassess its position to ensure that the interests of citizens along the James River are protected, and CENDAK supporters have already committed a substantial amount of their own money to studying the potential alternative use of facilities constructed for use in conjunction with the Oahe Unit. Finally, it is costing the government to maintain those facilities, and there is no point in delaying consideration of whether they can be put to productive use.

These are some of the causes of our sense of urgency, Frank and Chick; and, as you can understand, each of them is generating a certain amount of local political pressure upon us to achieve action. That is especially so since the Administration has endorsed the bill and particularly in the case of the emergency at Roscoe. Our constituents do not understand the routine delays in the legislative process, to which every Member of Congress has become accustomed, and this is simply and respectfully to convey once again our unified urging that S. 1553/H.R. 4347 be moved as quickly as possible.

Thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

James Abdnor,
U.S. Senator.
Larry Pressler,
U.S. Senator.
Clint Roberts,
Member of Congress.
Thomas Daschle,
Member of Congress.

In view of the nature of the WEB project the Department of Interior has expressed an intent to cooperate closely with the Farmers Home Administration in its implementation. The following are the texts of Assistant Secretary Garrey Carruthers' letter to WEB Chairman Kurle in that regard and the letter authored by Senator Pressler and cosigned by the entire delegation, seeking further clarification and documentation of the Department's intent:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., November 27, 1981.
Mr. Morris Kurle,
Chairman, WEB Water Development Association, Inc., Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Dear Mr. Kurle: Thank you for your letter of September 29 concerning the WEB Pipeline Project (WEB) in South Dakota.

As you may be aware, Commissioner Broadbent of the Bureau of Reclamation testified on H.R. 4347 before the House Conservation, Credit and Rural Development Subcommittee, House Committee on Agriculture, on September 9 and before the House Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on October 27, relative to WEB. Let me assure you that the Department of the Interior stands behind the Commissioner's statement at those hearings that we will do our utmost to see the WEB project developed as rapidly as possible.

In regard to Department of Agriculture continued involvement in the project, we envision some administrative difficulties for Interior to implement the project under Agriculture's rules and procedures. However, we do not see any difficulties that cannot be overcome with the cooperation that Agriculture has promised if it is the Congress' decision that Interior implement the project. Once the intent of the Congress is known, Interior, including Reclamation, and Agriculture will work out the appropriate relationships to see the project come to fruition as soon as practicable.

Sincerely,

Garrey E. Carruthers,
Assistant Secretary for Land and Water Resources.

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1982.
Mr. Garrey Carruthers,
Assistant Secretary for Land and Water Resources, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Carruthers: I am sure you are familiar with the legislation, S. 1553/H.R. 4347, concerning water development in South Dakota, which we have all sponsored. We are hopeful that action may soon be taken on this legislation in Congress. However, there is one administration issue that we would like to have clarified before final action is taken on the bill.

In the administration-proposed amendment to Section 1, subsection 3, the Secretary is directed to "use funds appropriated under this Act to provide financial assistance to plan and develop the WEB Rural Water Development Project under the terms and conditions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act and the rules and regulations promulgated by the Department of Agriculture under that Act, except to the extent such Act or rules or regulations promulgated thereunder are inconsistent with the provisions of this section."

We feel that the manner by which you intend to carry out these provisions should be clarified. It was our intent in drafting this legislation that the Farmers Home Administration would be the oversight agency for construction of the WEB Project.

To clarify this point, we urge you to reach an agreement, possibly in the form of a cooperative memorandum, with the Farmers Home Administration outlining how the oversight of the WEB Project will be done before final action is completed on the legislation.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter and look forward to working with you in the future.

James Abdnor,
U.S. Senator.
Larry Pressler,
U.S. Senator.
Clint Roberts,
U.S. Representative.
Thomas Daschle,
U.S. Representative.

During the period between adjournment of the first session of the 97th Congress and the convening of the second session, Congressman Roberts has worked with the Administration to broaden and clarify its position on section 4 of the bill, regarding the provision of Missouri Basin hydropower to certain projects in the Basin. Commissioner Broadbent's letter of January 26, 1982, provides the express legislative language supported by the Administration on section 4:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Reclamation,
Washington, D.C., January 26, 1982.
Hon. Clint Roberts,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Roberts: In response to your November 19, 1981, memorandum regarding access to Pick-Sloan project power for irrigation projects in addition to the Grass Rope Unit, the Department of the Interior does not object to amending Section 4 of H.R. 4347 to read as follows:

Section 4. The Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Department of Energy, is authorized to make available the Missouri River Basin program pumping power to new irrigation projects constructed by Indian tribes or by public entities organized under State law which have been authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 to receive such power. Such power shall be made available to the Grass Rope Unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. In recognition of the legislative intent of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program to provide project power to financially sound irrigation development, such power may also be made available at the Secretary's discretion for other such Federal or cooperative Federal/non-Federal irrigation projects, if requested by the Governor or an Indian tribe, provided that the Secretary determines the project to be economically and financially feasible and in compliance with applicable environmental laws, and submits such proposals to Congress subject to disapproval by joint resolution within 90 days.

The Office of Management and Budget has no objection to this proposed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

Robert N. Broadbent
Commissioner.

Finally, all four members of the South Dakota delegation joined in bipartisan sponsorship of S. 1553 and H.R. 4347. Hearings have been held in both the House and the Senate, and the House Subcommittee on Conversation, Credit and Rural Development has reported the bill, with amendments, to the full committee. The following is the text of H.R. 4347 as amended by the House subcommittee and endorsed by the Administration, and which is being pressed for prompt enactment by the South Dakota delegation:

H.R. 4347

A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with development of the WEB pipeline, to provide for the study of South Dakota water projects to be developed in lieu of the Oahe and Pollock-Herreid irrigation projects, and to make available Missouri basin pumping power to projects authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 to receive such power

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the WEB rural water development project, authorized by section 9 of Public Law 96-355, is reauthorized subject to the following changes in such section:

(1) the proviso clauses contained in subsection (b) shall not apply to the WEB Rural Water Development Project;

(2) the first sentence of subsection (d) is stricken; and

(3) the first sentence of subsection (e) is stricken and the following sentence is inserted in lieu thereof: "The Secretary of Interior shall use funds appropriated under this Act to provide financial asistance to plan and develop the WEB Rural Water Development Project under the terms and conditions of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act and the rules and regulations promulgated by the Department of Agriculture under that Act, except to the extent such Act or rules or regulations promulgated thereunder are inconsistent with the provisions of this section."

(b) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is directed to proceed with the development of the WEB Rural Water Development Project, consistent with the terms of section 9(e) of Public Law 96-355, as amended by section 1(a)(3) of this Act, and to make available for immediate obligation any funds appropriated for such project for fiscal year 1981.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized, in cooperation with the State of South Dakota, to conduct a study pursuant to this Act which shall include consideration of—

(1) alternate uses of facilities constructed for use in conjunction with the Oahe unit, initial stage, James division, Pick-Sloan Missouri River basin program, South Dakota;

(2) future uses in South Dakota of water delivered by the Garrison unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri River basin program, North Dakota; and

(3) a modified plan of development for the Pollock-Herreid unit, South Dakota pumping division, Pick-Sloan Missouri River basin program, South Dakota, including alternative lands or reduced acreages.

(b) In formulating his recommendations to Congress the Secretary shall take into account the land inundated in South Dakota under the Pick-Sloan Missouri basin program and the irrigation development authorized for South Dakota by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

(c) The Secretary shall report to Congress the findings of the studies, along with his recommendations for disposition of the Oahe unit, initial stage, for development of the Pollock-Herreid unit, and for Federal involvement in other projects proposed by the State.

(d) The Secretary may contract with the State to carry out the studies authorized by this section.

(e) The studies performed and the reports made under this section shall be of reconnaissance, appraisal, or feasibility grade as is appropriate to determine whether further action on the development of the Secretary's recommendations is warranted.

Sec. 3 (a) The Secretary is authorized to cancel the master contract and participating and security contracts for the Oahe Unit, Initial Stage: Provided, however, that such actions shall be done with the agreement of the Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict and the Spink and West Brown Irrigation Districts; and provided further, that any and all funds accumulated by the Oahe Conservancy Subdistrict under the Master Contract shall be refunded to or otherwise expended for the benefit of the taxpayers of the subdistrict; and that any repayment obligation existing at the time of cancellation of the Master and Security Contracts shall thereafter be treated as a deferred cost of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program to be assumed by the beneficiaries of any future project which utilizes the Oahe Unit facilities for which the repayment obligation was incurred.

(b) Those features of the authorized plan of development for the Oahe unit, initial stage, which were designed for and could be used only to deliver irrigation water to the Spink and West Brown irrigation districts namely: Faulkton, Cresbard, West Main, Redfield, James, and East Canals; Cresbard and Byron Dams and Reservoirs; James and Byron Pumping Plants; and associated features; shall not be constructed by the Secretary, but nothing in this Act shall be deemed to limit the authority of the Secretary to recommend development of other features, based upon the study authorized by section 2 (a)(1) of this Act.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Department of Energy, is authorized to make available the Missouri River Basin program pumping power to new irrigation projects constructed by Indian tribes or by public entities organized under State law which have been authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 to receive such power. Such power shall be made available to the Grass Rope Unit, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program. In recognition of the legislative intent of the Pick-Sloan Missouri River Basin Program to provide project power to financially sound irrigation development, such power may also be made available at the Secretary's discretion for other such Federal or cooperative Federal/non-Federal irrigation projects, if requested by the Governor or an Indian tribe, provided that the Secretary determines the project to be economically and financially feasible and in compliance with applicable environmental laws, and submits such proposals to Congress subject to disapproval by joint resolution within 90 days.

Sec. 5. Effective October 1, 1981, there are authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

In view of the support of the administration and the progress of the bill in the House, I trust that my colleagues in the Senate will give S. 1553 their prompt attention, and Senator Pressler and I certainly will be working toward that end.●

ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN

● Mr. QUAYLE. Mr. President, in a television interview which was aired on October 26 and 27, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the exiled Russian novelist, commented on a number of American policy issues ranging from the nature of our international broadcasting efforts to our diplomatic relationships with mainland China. As probably the foremost witness to the experience of living under Communist rule, Mr. Solzhenitsyn's views on East-West relations are always important and enlightening. In this particular interview, which was conducted by Representative John LeBoutillier, Mr. Solzhenitsyn identifies major shortcomings in Western broadcasts to the Soviet Union, warns against arming the People's Republic of China and urges the United States to undertake more forceful leadership of the free world.

Mr. President, for the benefit of those who may have missed this valuable broadcast, I ask that a transcript of the interview with Alexander Solzhenitsyn be printed in the Record. The following is part 1 of the transcript. The second part will be printed in tomorrow's Congressional Record.

Part 1 of the transcript follows:

(Translation from Russian of the October 12, 1981, Congressman John LeBoutillier interview with Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, part of which appeared on the NBC "Tomorrow" show on October 26 and 27)

J. LeB. Aleksandr Issayevich, if you could be director of radio-broadcasting to the Soviet Union, what would you do, and how would you do it?

A. S. Your question is not a strange one for me. For 30 years I have followed closely the concept of American Russian-language radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union. I am not going to say anthing about broadcasts in other languages. I don't know. Perhaps they make the same mistakes, perhaps not, but I know well how it is in the Russian language. Thirty years ago, in 1953, when I had just been freed from the labor camp, I bought a radio receiver with the first money I earned. This was during my exile in Kazakhstan, and it was even considered criminal there—suspicious—why should someone in exile buy himself a radio? But I listened intently through all that horrendous jamming, and tried to understand, to catch some bits of information. And I got to be so expert that even if I could only catch half a sentence, I could complete it from just a few words. For 20 years I listened constantly in the Soviet Union to Western Russian-language broadcasting and rejoiced in all its successes, and made use of its information, and was deeply distressed by its mistakes.

J. LeB. You mean—you sat there with your ear pressed close to the set and kept twisting dials to understand better?

A. S. Yes—in order to hear through all that racket, you have to know how to listen. If you hold your ear close to the set, you can sometimes hear better. And so I was saddened by the shortcomings of the broadcasts. And I must say that these shortcomings were a constant factor all those years. It is difficult to overestimate the importance these broadcasts could have if America conducted them properly.

L. LeB. Do you think that the people of the Soviet Union listen to the radio today and still have difficulty understanding?

A. S. Of course they listen, but many, like me, become disillusioned. You must understand—I am afaid that those who determine the general tone of American Russian-language broadcasts, did not understand from the beginning, and so not understand today, the main aims and purposes of these broadcasts. If they understood correctly, the picture over the past 30 years in the Soviet Union and in other communist countries would have changed. That is, I can say without exaggeration that maybe today we would not be thinking that there is danger of another world war. The objective should be to establish mutual trust, warm feelings, and contact with the oppressed peoples, and thus to tear them away, to help them tear themselves away, from their communist oppressors.

J. LeB. You say that for the past 30 years, America has made mistakes in policy in its broadcasts to the Soviet population, and that a third world war which we may be approaching could have been avoided if these mistakes had not occurred?

A. S. Yes. I am afraid that the theoreticians involved in your broadcasting do not understand this to this day, because today, even in recent years, the line is not only not better, but, as, for example, in "Radio Liberty," it is worse, much worse. In order correctly to formulate this general direction, one needs a clear answer to at least two questions. First question: what is the situation in those countries to which the broadcasts are beamed? And second question: what is the condition of these oppressed peoples, what are their needs what kind of spiritual hunger do they have? The West, the entire West, including the United States, seems to be bewitched—doomed eternally to have an incorrect idea about the situation in communist countries, doomed to draw for itself pleasant pictures, illusions, and to be guided by and follow these illusions. I want to remind you that in the '30's, during the most dreadful time of Stalinist terror, when Stalin destroyed many millions, during that particular time, your editorials proclaimed the Soviet Union to be a country of global justice, where the best truth on earth could be found. And at that same time, your President Roosevelt extended a helping hand to Stalin, and your businessmen jumped over there with technological assistance, without which Stalin could not have built his industry. And subsequently, at the end of the war, the American administration, without any need, made Stalin a gift of all of East Europe, and gave away China to communism. Question: With what objective in mind could a strong West sacrifice East Europe? Today, you are extolling Poland.

J. LeB. I want to be more specific. Do you think that at the time, President Roosevelt and the American government had a mistaken understanding of the Soviet government? They were people with whom one should not be friendly?

A. S. It should have been understood that they were enemies of their own people, and this was not understood. The Roosevelt administration, and, for decades afterwards, American public opinion, identified the Soviet government with its oppressed people. While, in actual fact, they are categorically opposed to each other. And so, as I say, today you enthuse over the stoicism of Poland—but why did you hand Poland over to communist slavery—why? Today, it is very fashionable to say that there, for some reason, in that same Soviet Union—why don't they fight?—these slaves, who do not want to fight for their freedom. But I consider slaves not those who sit in prisons. I consider slaves those free people who see how prisons are built, and give their blessing—let them build prisons! Today, recently—the anniversary of the Berlin Wall was marked. Who are the slaves? The slaves are the East Germans who could not prevent the construction of this wall, the slaves are those Western powers who stood by quietly and watched the construction of the Berlin Wall—and did not interfere? The slaves are those in West Germany, who today went to demonstrate against the arrival of Haig, that's who the slaves are—who today are stretching out their hand to Soviet shackles, they voluntarily want to go the Gulag, that's who the slaves are!

J. LeB. Can you tell our viewers briefly the difference between the Soviet government and the Russian people? In your words, the government—is the enemy of the people?

A. S. That is a basic fact, which should always be understood as the foundation of something your leaders are always forgetting.

J. LeB. Does this apply to all communist countries?

A. S. Definitely to all the communist countries. But the Western conception is: since in the West the government is elected by the people, you think that the government and the people are one and the same. In actual fact, no, with us, there is a gulf between.

J. LeB. In your words, then, it appears that we should aim at finding allies among the Russian people against the Soviet government?

A. S. Yes. Yes. I want to say that Roosevelt made a great historical mistake in the '30's and '40's. This mistake cost the whole world exactly half of the globe—perhaps less than half in terms of territory, but more than half in population. And today, the greatest danger if you do not resolve it, is that you can repeat the same fatal mistake made by Roosevelt. Strangely enough, the same mistake has been repeated all these years. For instance, with Tito. Tito—was the murderer, the executioner, of his people. Right after the World War, he destroyed, he shot, hundreds of thousands of his citizens. And was longing to seize Trieste. And insolently shot down American civil planes near the Austrian border. All this is now forgotten and forgiven. And he was held up as a great statesman, a leader of some kind of non-existent "non-aligned" movement.

J. LeB. In America, right up to his death, he was considered practically a hero. He was what we are wont to call a "good communist". But we know that there are no "good communists". President Carter was even proud that he sent his mother to Tito's funeral.

A. S. The same thing being repeated with Cuba. It was proclaimed in the West that what was transpiring in Cuba was a people's revolution. And the same thing is being repeated in North Vietnam. There was a totalitarian gang there which was acting to seize the whole country. And your progressives proclaimed that it was a national movement for freedom. Nicaragua—right before your eyes—a totalitarian group of communists were seizing power, and the Carter administration hurried to help them with money, so as to strengthen its soon-to-be enemy. But the worst of all is China.

J. LeB. Before talking about China, why, strictly speaking, is it so fashionable among our progressive public figures to praise the régimes in Nicaragua and the partisans in Salvador, and also the régimes in Cambodia and Vietnam?

A. S. That is the fatal historical mistake of liberalism, not to see the enemy on the left, to consider that the enemy is always on the right, and that there is no enemy on the left. It is the same mistake which ruined Russian liberalism in 1917. They overlooked the danger of Lenin. And the same thing is being repeated today—the mistake of Russian liberalism is being repeated on a worldwide scale everywhere.

J. LeB. Do you think that our policy of drawing closer to Red China is on the same level as the mistake made by Roosevelt when he became friendly with Stalin?

A. S. Indeed it is on the same level. Indeed it is. If you repeat that mistake today—today China is in the same situation as was the Soviet Union in the '30's; it is in need of everything. It needs aid from America. If you now provide it with American economy, and then with weapons, yes, for awhile China will serve as a safeguard against the Soviet Union, but even that is problematical. But if you arm China, then, as a result, you will give it the second half of the Earth, that second half which contains America, and then you will have no one to use as a shield.

J. LeB. Do you think that the Peking government—Mao's government—disposed of its people as cruelly as the Soviet leaders?

A. S. Definitely. They acted exactly the same way. And they destroyed millions, even more, probably, in proportion to the population. But China is even more closed to foreigners than the Soviet Union. You know even less about China than about the Soviet Union. That's why the legend has been created about the "good" communism in China. When, in 30-40 years from now you read the Chinese "Gulag Archipelago", you will be amazed: "Ach, what a pity, and we didn't know!" You must know! you must know in time, and not when it is too late. You need to know now today! I want to say that in the long run this mistake threatens you with the loss of existence of America itself.

But, closer to our subject, our talk is not pointless. The thing is—very recently, the Director of the United States International Communications Agency went to China and came back with rosy impressions. He announced that he was amazed at the friendly talk of the Chinese leaders. And how should they talk if they are in need of your technical know-how—how else should they talk? He confidently repeats what he was told there: that China is striving for human rights; that China is trying to become an open society; that the Chinese Communist leadership cares about the development of its people. And your Director of the International Communications Agency is now repeating all this!

J. LeB. Many levels of society in America are very concerned about the progress of underdeveloped nations, human rights, aid to the needy. Do you think that the leaders of Red China say all this to their American visitors only to derive some benefit form them?

It is exactly the same picture, the same hypocrisy shown for decades by the Soviet government. They talk in order to get something.

J. LeB. We have lots of arguments here in America on questions of human rights in other countries. For instance, when the Persian shah was overthrown, it was said in our country that he was a bad ruler, that he violated human rights. Very few of the shah's critics would maintain that there are more human rights in Iran today. Are there any communist countries in which human rights are observed?

A. S. When the Chinese government says that it supposedly cares about the development of the people, it is hard to imagine anything more senseless. No communist government ever cares about the rights, the development of its people. Communist governments are like cancerous tumors: they grow senselessly, for two aims only: first of all, to strengthen their power, and, as soon as they strengthen their power, to expand to further boundaries. The Soviet government always had such aims in mind, and the Chinese government has those same aims, and only those same aims. Note that as soon as the "Washington Post" correspondent reported one incident where a Chinese was in prison for defending human rights, he was given a strict warning that he would be expelled. And with such a government your "Voice of America" concludes an agreement about a battle against disinformation! That is completely ludicrous. What kind of disinformation can the Chinese radio help you battle? The chinese radio is busy spreading solid disinformation; it conceals everything going on in its country; it is the embodiment of disinformation. Or, for instance, about Cambodia. Is the Chinese radio really going to help the "Voice of America" find out how the Khmer Rouge forces destroyed their people? Or help to find the mass graves of over 60,000 Cambodians? As I said, Western society seems doomed always to have an incorrect picture of the situation in communist countries.

As for the second question: it is no less difficult to understand the state of the people toward whom the radio broadcasts are directed, to understand their spriritual hunger, their difficulties, their aspirations. Socrates' philosophy has been famous since ancient times: if you want to convince the person with whom you are talking, assume his point of view and develop it further. And a proverb says: if you want to have a friend, first become a friend yourself.

J. LeB. Don't you think it strange that, just as in Communist countries, a gap between the government and the people exists with us too, a colossal difference between those who run the country, and the people?

A. S. With you the gap is not so hopeless, and it has a different meaning. But I must say, if I compare my impressions of my Vermont surroundings, of the simple folk here, with the New York or Washington press, it grieves me to say that yes, there is a big gap. This gap is not a confrontation, not the relationship which exists in Communist countries, not the relationship between oppressors and the oppressed. But even you have differences of opinion.

J. LeB. Do you think that our leadership is rather more naive than acting with malicious intent?

A. S. Quite right.

J. LeB. Does this mean that instead of pointing a pistol at the back of the head and shooting people, we lead them to the slaughter with eyes closed?

A. S. The root of all this lies in your leaders of public opinion who influence government policy. They have for decades been nurturing illusions and false impressions, especially in relation to countries opposing America. They constantly paint a more rosy, pleasant picture than is actually the case.

J. LeB. Let us talk now about the internal situation in the Soviet Union. Our population does not know either from magazines or from the press or television what life is like in the Soviet Union.

A. S. And for those living in the Soviet Union it is even harder to get real information. Foreign information in the Soviet papers and on television is distorted beyond recognition. Domestic information is even more distorted. Those who live in the Soviet Union know vaguely, in a general way, what is happening in the world, but they know nothing of what goes on in the neighboring town, in the neighboring county. That is why foreign broadcasts are so important for them—they can get news about themselves—about what is happening to us.

J. LeB. In America, during the Vietnam War, all Americans could follow military events on their television screen, on the news. But the average Soviet—does he know what's going on in—let's say, Afghanistan?

A. S. Everything he hears from the government is distorted. And the Voice of America's mistake is that it has limited itself in its source of information. It believes, for instance, that it has the right to broadcast only in a way which will not irritate the communist listener and not to use a rich accumulation of anti-communist material. For instance, there is an emigré anti-communist magazine, Possey, in Frankfurt am Main. It contains plenty of material about Afghanistan; its reporters travel to Afghanistan and meet with Afghan resistance fighters. Never would the Voice of America lower itself to broadcast this to the Soviet Union, because it comes from a magazine which is too anti-communist. Instead, the Voice of America feeds us with some kind of third-rate gossip about what diplomats in Delhi hear third-hand. Actually, instead of effectively giving us news, the Voice of America, in general, helps us not to be informed. This is tied in with the mistake in principal ascribed to the Voice of America—it has to act so as, God forbid, not to violate the policy of the State Department. And so they give us a stone instead of bread, instead of the real information which they could give us.

Here is another example: the famous Novocherkassk rebellion took place in the Soviet Union in 1962, but for over ten years, there was not a word about it on Western radio broadcasts—not one! never! because either they did not know about it, or it was not from "sufficiently proven" sources! Because, if they do not have documentary proof, they can't broadcast about rebellions. And so, it was not until ten years later that we heard news over Western broadcasts about our own great rebellion in Novocherkassk.

J. LeB. Two brief observations: you say that, in order not to irritate the Soviet leaders, our government, our State Department, and the radio stations which they run, deliberately soften the tone of the broadcasts and do not broadcast news which could displease the Soviet leaders, and broadcast harmless news instead?

A. S. I can speak from personal experience. In December, 1973, when I was still in the Soviet Union, Gulag Archipelago was published in the West and the Voice of America, or, strictly speaking, a Voice of America announcer, read an excerpt from Gulag on the air. Immediately Radio Moscow started screaming that the Voice of America had no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, that is served to spoil the international atmosphere. And what did the Voice of America do? With the agreement of the State Department, it took the announcer off that assignment, and forbade the reading of Gulag Archipelago to Russia! More than that: for several years, it was forbidden to quote Solzhenitsyn on the Voice of America, so as not to harm communist propaganda. This means: my book was written for Russians, millions of copies were read in the West, but it should not be read to our Motherland! because, otherwise, the Voice of America would spoil relations with the Soviet Union. In such a way, information for our country is silenced. I would not want to lose our train of thought, and want to speak of the situation of the people to whom these broadcasts are beamed

J LeB. Yes, it is important to find out what life is like in the Soviet Union.

A. S. For 65 years, we have been working almost for nothing. For 65 years, both the mother and the father in the family have worked, and their combined earnings are insufficient to support a family. Their work is never paid for any higher than 10 or 20 percent of what it is worth. All the surplus is taken by the government in order to ready weapons and attacks on other countries in the world. Several generations of us have gone hungry for 65 years! It is already becoming close to physical degeneration. We are poisoned with alcohol. Women are carrying a load which men could not manage, a double load. Our birthrate is sharply lower, and infant mortality has sharply risen. We are poisoned both physically and morally. Physically poisoned, because all the military manufacturing is done without any protection of the surrounding environment. There is no-one to control water pollution, air pollution. We are poisoned morally because for 65 years we have been inculcated with communist lies. The combination of all this has brought the people to a state close to death, to spiritual and physical death. All memory of our past, our history, and especially the history of the last century, has been wiped out. The history of the last century is particularly dangerous for the communists, because it was their enemy. Those who are acquainted with history before the revolution, and the history of the revolution and after the revolution—they are already free of the communists. But the communists are carefully destroying all traces of the truth, so that we won't know anything about ourselves. I would compare it with when, in Stalinist times, the father and the mother of a family were both arrested, and little children were sent to an orphanage, and their last names were changed so that they never knew whose children they were, what their origins were, what their past. And our people are in the same situation. They are deprived of any memories about themselves. Our people are like someone fatally ill who is lying in bed, dying, and the American radio broadcasts are like a visitor who comes by—not a doctor—but a visitor, who comes in very self-satisfied, cheerful, beautifully dressed, sits down and starts saying: "Now I will entertain you, now I will tell you how many suits I have, how I dress, what a wonderful apartment I have, what I recently bought, how much money I save, what a good time I have—you want me "to do a little dance for you?" That's the way radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union are run today.

J. LeB. In other words, you say that the contents of our broadcasts to those who are so oppressed only shows them a world in which they cannot live anyway, and gives them nothing to appease their spiritual hunger, nothing with which to resist the yoke of their government.

A. S. And not only that, not only that. Yes, they don't offer anything to slake our spiritual hunger. Instead of that a foreign voice reads us lectures on how to understand the world—a suicidal stand for radio broadcasts. Propaganda is conducted on how to understand from a liberal-domocratic point of view, but all propaganda has become repulsive to us after 60 years. And that's only one side. It is the most important side for our people, but there is another side, the most important for your people. Your broadcasts give a picture which does not correspond to the spiritual life of your people. Your broadcasts are conducted so primitively that they give a false picture of your country, they speak about the most superficial, the most trite things. So that our people have a lower opinion of the American people than the American people deserve. Your broadcasts are full of rubbish.

If one were to speak, for instance, of the Voice of America, one could list many broadcasts on which it is impossible to understand why America spends money, instead of spending it on something worth broadcasting. For instance, I will tell you: there are three different jazz programs; then a separate program of pop music, a separate program of dance music, and a separate youth program, on which all this is repeated. This is such a mistake; perhaps those people who are interested in jazz might turn on their radio five minutes earlier or turn it off five minutes later and hear something besides jazz. But the thing is, we have very few people who are interested in jazz, they don't need your programs, which are jammed, because they have at their disposal all the world jazz programs which no one jams. They can hear these programs perfectly. So you do not attract any listeners that way, you only spend valuable air-time on nonsense, on frivolousness. Or, for instance, sports. With great importance, with great solemnity, you broadcast programs on sports. But sports is a favorite subject of Soviet radio, it is the only subject which the Soviet radio willingly instills in our youth. Because in the Soviet Union, sports acts as opium for the people. It diverts young people from thinking about their situation, about their origin, and about politics. And here your broadcasts are busy with all this meaningless stuff. Even worse—you find time to broadcast about "hobbies". This program only repels and angers the Soviet listener and makes him turn off the radio and not listen any more; he feels only contempt for such a broadcast, because he is being told how loafers who have lots of time at their disposal collect labels from something or other, or empty bottles. That's just awful! Or, in great detail, it gloats over the conveniences of international travel. And all this time could be spent on subjects which would be valuable for us, which your radio doesn't even think of broadcasting, particularly, history and religion.

J. LeB. In other words, the contents of our programs to the Soviet Union are unpleasant, irritate people, do not take into consideration the situation in the Soviet Union, and we do not do what America should be doing for oppressed people?

A. S. I would sum it up like this: your radio broadcasts do not give our people the spiritual help they need. That's one side. The other side—you present yourselves as being lower and less significant that you really are, i.e., you are doing yourselves harm. And in the third place, you limit even simple information about current events. In matters of foreign policy, you are being over scrupulous about your use of sources—as with Afghanistan. And insofar as the internal situation in the Soviet Union is concerned, you have been concentrating only on material provided by dissidents from Moscow. If tomorrow the dissident movement should be completely destroyed, you would lose such information altogether. But there are great fields of information about the Soviet Union of which we need to hear, and which your radio station either does not have, or does not wish to use for lack of sufficient proof. And what is given instead? Instead, there is wide coverage on Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union. That is, half-hour after half-hour is spent on interviews with recent emigrés: how they like America; how they have found work; how much they earn; how they furnished their houses. Not that there is anything bad about this, except that it is disproportionately exaggerated, and replaces information about the situation in the Soviet Union. And what feelings must it arouse in the Soviet listener? Irritation? No one of the Soviet population can immigrate to the West. Only a certain number of Jews can immigrate to the West. Why then boast about how well they are doing, why irritate those who are left there?

J. LeB. So our broadcasts irritate those who cannot leave with tales of how well we live here?

A. S. It is tactless. Our people want to be told about our workers, how they fare in our country—but your broadcasts do not speak about that. What is the situation of our peasantry? There is never a broadcast on that subject. The situation in the provinces. The cruel situation in the army. They listen to the broadcasts in the army, there are many shortwave sets there. But nothing is ever broadcast about any of this. And your stations don't even want to know anything about it. For instance, we still have a devastating problem about our war invalids. Invalids from the Great Patriotic War are hidden from society, so that no one can see them; they are exiled to remote northern islands—war invalids who have lost their health in defense of their country. War invalids are persecuted, constrained. There is nothing of this on the radio—only tales of happy fugitives, how well those who fled from all this are living.

J. LeB. How about the Soviet army? You say that they have radio sets to which they can listen, and we do not try to communicate with the Soviet soldiers. Is there a possibility of demoralization? Because they say that the troops sent to Afghanistan refuse to shoot at the Moslems, at the civilian population.

A. S. Unfortunately, you have never been interested in the situation of the Soviet worker, the Soviet peasant, the Soviet soldier. They are all under dreadful pressure, and your radio broadcasts have never concerned themselves with investigating this, with getting such information and airing it. I repeat, there is much such information available in the emigré press, and it could all have been broadcast to the USSR without much effort, but that could violate the policy of the State Department, the Moscow leaders might suddenly get mad at the State Department and refuse to purchase from you the modern electronics without which they cannot live. That is what you are afraid of!

The greatest need of our people is to become aware of themselves as what they really are. If during these 30 years you had helped our people remember who they were, to help them to rise spiritually to their feet—the entire world situation today would be different. All our recent history has been trampled under and distorted beyond recognition, it is saturated with propaganda. I would like very much for the American TV viewer to imagine this for himself, it is difficult to imagine. Our average citizen in essence knows nothing: what were the causes of the revolution; how the revolution occurred, how it all went over to the bolsheviks under a totalitarian rule; what great people's movements there were against the bolsheviks, and how they were suppressed, how our peasantry and our working class were destroyed by terrorist means. We need to know the truth about all this. And if such knowledge were given us, we would become spiritually free of our government—both those in civilian life and those in the army. But the general goals and general programs of your broadcasts are run by ideologists who, unfortunately, are under the influence of myths, false myths about Russia. I must say that in the first of these myths we find Karl Marx. Marx proclaimed that the Russian people, as such, in general, the Russian people were "reactionary". And from that it followed: all of Russian history was "reactionary", the monarchy was "reactionary", Russian impressions of tradition were "reactionary", the majority of the Russian leaders were "reactionaries", even our orthodox religion was "reactionary". And this is what the ideologists of your radio broadcasts do: they ram through our history like a burst of machine gun fire, they shoot down two-thirds of our historical figures, fearful that some one of them might be "reactionary". If some American journalist—just one—or a second-rate American scholar—once said about some Russian leader that he was "reactionary"—that Russian leader or philosopher is eliminated from history—he no longer exists. Paradoxically, the ideologists of your broadcasts stretch out their hand to Communists. The Communists fight against our memory of history, and your broadcasts do the same. I cannot not mention the most recent example: recently, this September, was the 70th anniversary of the death, of the day of the murder of the greatest Russian statesman of the 20th century, Prime Minister Stolypin. It is not enough that the very act of his murder inaugurated the terror of the 20th century, but this man in 5 years succeeded in pulling Russia out of complete chaos and disintegration into a state of prosperity.

And so, two of your radio stations, under different management, Radio Liberty and the Voice of America, both killed a broadcast on Stolypin, the anniversary broadcast. A fine broadcast was prepared at Radio Liberty; it was forbidden without any discussion or explanation. And a few days ago, the Voice of America announced an 8-minute reading from my chapter on Stolypin. The broadcast was already announced, but it was immediately killed. This shows that it is not a question of different administrators, but of your dominant ideology.

No matter what one thinks of Stolypin—some consider him a liberal, others a conservative—he was a great Russian statesman—how can he be censored? I would like to call attention to the amazing fact that American broadcasts, both radio stations, independent of each other, carry out censorship, moreover, censorship in advance, even in such scandalous circumstances, as when listeners have already been told that the broadcast would take place, and then it is cancelled. This year "Radio Liberty" used censorship in advance only in fundamental Russian-language broadcasts; moreover they intend to enlarge their bureaucratic superstructure, to bring in consulting advisors, exclusively for the purposes of censorship. It's hard to absorb this. To increase expenses, to enlarge the organization for the purposes of censorship!

J. LeB. Let us talk now about the state of religion in the Soviet Union. Has the Soviet government been suppressing religion since 1917? Do they want to destroy spiritual sources, to destroy the soul?

A. S. All of Marxism is based on hatred of religion, and Lenin, when he came to power—it seems paradoxical—did not perceive a more dangerous enemy than Russian Christianity, and he carried out violent attacks on it—Lenin, even then—and this continued during Stalin, and Khrushchev, and Brezhnev, in a somewhat different form. Russian Orthodoxy, during these 65 years, has suffered its own Golgotha. We have experienced persecution which surpasses in dimension all the persecution of Chritianity in ancient times. Limitless efforts were made to destroy Christianity in Russia, to root it completely out of memory and heart. That is the consistent policy of the Soviet government, and it has resulted in tens of millions of people not being able to go to church. Many people live in places where the nearest church is 300 miles away, i.e., they can go, say, to have a child christened, but they cannot get there on Sundays. Our population is in dire need of listening to church services over the radio, to mark, over the radio, our Christian holidays, to have our divine services, our terminology explained. To have a broadcast for children, who are most of all deprived of religion in the USSR. Communist power has deprived us of all this, and your radio broadcasts, your ideologists, proceeding from the stupid thought that Russian Christianity is "reactionary", conduct that same communist line, again, they echo the communist position; i.e., they are suppressing Christianity there, and your people here are trying with all their might to squeeze and force out Russian Orthodoxy.

J. LeB. You probably find it amusing when you hear that Carter, for instance said that he thought he could convert Brezhnev to christianity.

A. S. Horrible! And so, all these 30 years your broadcasts have been directed at, deliberately directed at, systematically aimed at not allowing Russian Orthodoxy to rise up and become an organizational social power in Russia.

J. LeB. Let us talk briefly about the situation in Poland today, because in Poland there is organized dissidence, opposition to the government. How much do you think this has been helped by a Polish Pope?

A. S. The Polish Pope has been of considerable inspiration to the Poles. But aside from that, the Catholic Church has never been as demolished as our Orthodox Church. I don't know anything about the American Polish-language broadcasts. I assume that they were excellent. I assume that they supported Polish Catholicism, strengthened it. But for the Russian people, the broadcasts are conducted in just the opposite way, i.e., it is as if you deliberately set up the task of not creating a Polish situation in our country, so that we could not have such strength in the Church, and such religious unification as in Poland.

J. LeB. In Poland there is an example of good radio broadcasts in co-operation with the Church, under the sponsorship of a leader like the Pope, which could act for unity? I would like to ask you about reports from the Vatican—that they suspect that the Soviets, the Kremlin, participated in the attempt on the life of the Pope.

A. S. There can be no doubt that a Polish Pope greatly hampered, and continues to hamper, Soviet communists by his very existence.

J. LeB. You would not be surprised if through the terrorist network they found out about the Turk who wanted to kill the Pope, and the Soviets told their agents?

A. S. I don't doubt that, in general, world terrorism is run by the Soviets, yes.

J. LeB. I would like to sum up what has been said. We are not speaking about large expenditures, we are speaking about a change in the fundamental approach to the direction and the contents of the Voice of America and Radio Liberty. When we held elections last year, we elected a man who holds very clear views in relation to the Soviet government, there can be no doubt about that. He said of the Soviets that they reserve the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat, in order to achieve world domination. It is clear that President Reagan understands the Soviet approach. Do you see any difference in our approach to broadcasts to the USSR during the past year?

A. S. The President cannot have had enough time in this one year, given the numerous branches of such a tremendous government as that of the United States. That is probably why he has not yet been able to do anything about the radio broadcasts. And, paradoxically, I must say, the year '81 has seen in Radio Liberty a sharp turn for the worse. Everything that for years was getting worse was made even more so by the famous memorandum which was accepted for implementation by the radio station Radio Libery. But if they don't stop going in that direction, they will once and for all mess up the Russian Department of Radio Liberty. I will not say anything about the 15 other languages in which Radio Liberty broadcasts, which I don't know, but the 16th, for Russians, has degenerated to such an extent is so bad that, if things continue in the same direction, it would be better to do away with it altogether. Because it harms the relation of the Russian and the American people even further.

J. LeB. You pointed out that if 30 years ago we had behaved differently we might have prevented World War III. But in October of '81, we are saying that nothing has changed, that everything is only worse. Is it really too late, if we do change, or is a Third World War really inevitable?

A. S. A Latin proverb says "dum spiro, spero"—where there's life, there's hope. Yes, 30 years have gone by, but that does not mean that we should not begin again today. We do not know how much time history will give us, and maybe it is still possible to accomplish much if you actively undertook to improve your broadcasts. I emphasize that I am not even speaking about an increase in the budget, but about changing the fundamental direction, to sober up, to come to your senses.

J. LeB. That is, we should change our broadcasts to the Soviet people? But we must also, I think, change our approach to trade with the Soviet Union—not to give them modern electronics which they will use for arms against the West; that, you know, is a continuation of the Roosevelt policy.

A. S. We are today concentrating on the problems of radio broadcasting, and, in general, I said yes, a historical mistake was made when you gaave away half the Earth. Do not repeat today this same mistake, and by trusting China, give away the other half of the Earth; for now I see as the main threat in the foreign policy of the present American administration its trust in China. This is impossible! They are exactly the same communists, with the same methods, and with the same policy of annihilation.

J. LeB. You said that ever since you left the Soviet Union you have cherished the hope of returning to Russia. Time is passing, and our government has not changed its policy. Is your hope, perhaps fading?

A. S. You know—no—my hope is not fading. God willing, I still have some time to live. And, in the meantime, I have not wasted time—I am writing constantly. I am now finishing and epopée of the history of the 1917 Revolution. And besides, a writer always has a way out—if he himself does not return to his Motherland, his books will.

J. LeB. Your books, "Gulag" and others, are for some reason forbidden by our radio stations. If this policy changes, could you in some way change the substance of radio programs to the Soviet people?

A. S. I have said today much that needed to be said. But I think that all efforts and possibilities are in the hands of your administration.

J. LeB. I think that the majority of people who see this program will be amazed that our government does not want your words to be heard by your people, that it is not the Soviet Union—it is our government which does not allow it, particularly, when the censorship is our government—which only does this because it is afraid to distress and anger the Soviet leaders. The majority of our listeners will not only be amazed or shocked, they will want to know why this is so, and why it continues to be so. In appearing on a program such as this, you must know that it is accessible to the average person in our country, to a wide circle of average people, and gives them information which they have never had before.

A. S. I understand. I will be very happy if we have helped in clearing up the situation.

(Translated by Julia Mansvetov.)●

PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY ACT

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on November 19 of last year, I joined with Senator D'Amato in introducing three bills to amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act. I did so because I am convinced that the act, passed in 1935, long ago achieved its primary goals. It now serves as only an unwieldy and unproductive obstruction to corporate diversification and prudent financial management by utility companies.

Because of my strong belief on this matter, I took the further step, on December 16, of introducing S. 1977 which would repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act in its entirety. I felt that total repeal was an option which should be considered by the Congress in addressing the anachronisms of the act.

Mr. President, the following week, much to my surprise and delight, I received a copy of a letter from the Securities and Exchange Commission which recommended full repeal of the Public Utility Holding Company Act. That letter was in response to a query by Senator D'Amato concerning the Commission's view with respect to the three bills which we had introduced. I feel that this letter, reflecting unanimous agreement by those who are most experienced in dealing with this act, serves as perhaps the ultimate evidence in favor of repeal. I would now ask that this letter be printed in the Record and I would commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

Securities and
Exchange Commission,
Washington, D.C., December 21, 1981.

Re proposals to amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (S. 1869, S. 1870, and S. 1871).

Hon. Alfonse M. D'Amato,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Securities, Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman D'Amato: In response to a request from your staff, I am writing to advise you of the Commission's general views relating to the above three bills. These bills would substantially reduce regulation under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935. The Commission, however, unanimously believes that Congress should instead repeal the Act. Based on the information available to the Commission and its experience under the Act, we believe that this statute has served its basic purpose and that continued federal regulation of utility holding companies is unnecessary and inappropriate.

The Securities and Exchange Commission has administered the 1935 Act for nearly forty-seven years. There is a consensus—shared by the Commission—that the Commission's task of reorganizing the Nation's gas and electric utility holding company systems was completed twenty years ago. The Commission's administration of the Act in more recent years has primarily involved review of registered holding company financings, mergers, and acquisitions and the consideration of requests for exemptions from the Act. These remaining Commission responsibilities are intended to prevent recurrence of the abuses which led to the original passage of the Act. The Commission believes, however, that these abuses are unlikely to recur in light of the extensive changes since 1935 in the public utility and investment banking industries, the accounting profession, state utility regulation, expansion of the disclosure requirements under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the development of more efficient and well-informed securities markets. If the 1935 Act is repealed, all publicly-owned utility holding company systems will, of course, continue to be subject to the financial disclosure requirements and other provisions of the federal securities laws.

Moreover, certain features of the 1935 Act set it apart from the other statutes which the Commission administers. The federal securities laws focus primarily on disclosures to investors and on the integrity of the securities markets. In contrast, acquisitions, financings, and other actions by registered public utility holding company systems require prior Commission approval under the 1935 Act. The Commission must base its approval or disapproval of these transactions on its determination of their economic merits. Thus, unlike the other statutes it administers, the 1935 Act involves the Commission very deeply in the substance of fundamental management decisions.

Only twelve active holding company systems remain subject to direct regulation under the 1935 Act. The Act, however, continues to have significant influence on the financing and diversification decisions of a much larger portion of the industry. Approximately eighty holding company systems operate under various exemptions from the Act, and many utilities may be reluctant to form holding companies because they would then have to register under the Act or qualify for an exemption. Furthermore, in this time of energy shortages and the recognized need to develop new energy resources, the Act may deter non-utilities from participating in cogeneration projects or other such activities because of the consequences of becoming subject to the Act.

The Commission finds it difficult to support any of the three legislative proposals presently before Congress because each primarily addresses only those aspects of the Act that affect one segment of the industry. Each would have the practical effect of virtually repealing the Act as it affects that particular industry segment. Taken together, the three proposals approach total repeal and would leave the Commission with responsibility for administering only the very limited surviving provisions of the Act with no clear regulatory purpose. None of the three proposals takes the further step of addressing the basic rationale for continued regulation under the Act.

For these reasons, it is appropriate and timely for Congress to revisit the 1935 Act. Congress should not, however, limit its evaluation to the merits of these specific proposals, but should also reexamine the underlying premises of the Act to determine the extent to which those premises have continuing viability today.

Because of the importance I attach to eliminating unnecessary regulatory burdens, I wanted to inform you promptly of the Commission's general position on the pending bill. The Commission will submit a detailed, formal statement of views at an appropriate time. In the interim, if members of your staff would like additional information, they should contact our General Counsel, Edward F. Greene, or Elinor Gammon in the Office of the General Counsel.

Sincerely yours,

John S. R. Shad.●

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR MIGRATION

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a critical link in the international community's ability to respond to the needs of refugees and migrants is the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM). This past year ICM celebrated its 30th year of service by assisting more than 205,000 refugees and migrants.

This is the third consecutive year that ICM has moved more than 200,000 persons, mostly refugees in every region of the world. In addition, some 3,000 migrants and returnees—highly skilled and professional personnel and their families—were identified, processed, and settled in developing countries in Latin America where their skills and presence are needed and welcomed.

Half of these were Latin Americans involved in ICM's return-of-talent program. Under this new program, Latin Americans who have gained training and experience in Europe and Canada and the United States are encouraged ans assisted in returning to their homelands to fill vacancies in skilled and professional fields vital to their country's development.

Mr. President, these are just some of the services and programs ICM undertakes each year in behalf of refugees and migrants. As refugee problems and migration pressures escalate throughout the world, we are reminded once again that ICM is a lifeline of hope for millions in need.

I ask that IMC's report on its achievements in 1981 be printed at this point in the Record.

The report follows:

[From the Monthly Dispatch, January 1982]

Insights/Sidelights to Current Activities in the Field of Refugee Resettlement and National Migration

SUMMARY OF NOTABLE ACHIEVEMENTS AND EVENTS IN 1981

A total of 205,500 refugees and migrants were processed and moved for permanent resettlement under ICM auspices in 1981—the third consecutive year that the organization's programme topped the 200,000 mark. The 1981 workload was comprised of 159,000 Indochinese, 24,500 Eastern Europeans, 12,000 persons from Africa and the Middle East, 4,500 Latin Americans, and 5,500 Western Europeans. Of this total, 3,000 were resettled in Australia, 3,200 in Africa and Asia, 16,250 in Canada, 2,050 in Israel, 3,000 in Latin America, 150,000 in the United States and 28,000 in Western European countries.

Included in the 1981 programme were some 3,000 migrants and returnees (highly skilled and professional personnel plus their dependents) who had been identified, processed, moved and placed in developing countries in Latin America. More than 50 per cent of these were Latin Americans who had gained training and experience in industrialized countries and who had returned to their homeland or region of origin—Return-of-Talent. This programme is of a special interest to the Latin American countries because it enables them to fill vacancies in priority sectors when specialized manpower is not otherwise available, and covers a wide spectrum of activities vital to socio-economic advancement. It is of significance to note that during 1961 this Return-of-Talent programmme, which previously had been operated from Western European countries only, was extended to the United States with very encouraging results.

ICM's 8th Seminar on Adaptation and Integration of Migrants was held in Geneva during the period 6-10 April, 1981. This Seminar, which dealt with the problems of Migrant and Refugee Women, had 190 participants representing 39 governments and 42 international and non-governmental organizations. The participants called upon governments to re-affirm and implement the fundamental principles of international law ensuring women's equal protection under the law, the universal right to preservation of the family unit, and the universal right to health care. They urged a greater public awareness of the positive contributions made by migrant and refugee women to the economy, culture and society at large. ICM was called upon to promote increased attention to the needs of migrant and refugee women and to stimulate programmes, projects and research for their benefit.

During the period 26-28 May 1981 a Regional Seminar on Transfer of Technology through Specialized Human Resources was staged under ICM auspices in Panama City. This Seminar dealt with priority requirements in the field of human resources, the brain-drain phenomenon and ways and means to counteract it, and programming for placing Integrated Experts in key posts in developing countries. The Panama City Seminar was attended by representatives of governments of the Central American Isthmus countries, Mexico, USA, five Caribbean nations and certain European ICM member countries, as well as representatives of four international organizations, i.e., EEC, ILO, OAS, and UNDP. Following a review of ICM's activities, the organization was urged to continue, strengthen and extend its programmes for Transfer of Technology through Specialized Human Resources.

In early June 1981, the ICM Director received official communications from Austria's Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Interior concerning the heavy influx of Eastern European asylum-seekers into Austria and seeking the organization's assistance in facilitating and speeding up the resettlement processing and movement of these refugees from Austria. On the basis of these communications, the Director contacted the traditional refugee and migrant receiving countries appealing for resettlement opportunities and financial assistance to enable ICM to be responsive to the Austrian government's request. ICM also re-inforced its staff in Austria to cope with increased operations. Despite the special efforts throughout the year to effect resettlement of the maximum number, some 43,000 of these Eastern European asylum-seekers (mostly Poles) remained in Austria as at 31 December 1981, 23,000 of whom were receiving care and maintenance assistance from the Austrian government.

In early July 1981, ICM's 3 millionth migrant, a Colombian physician with highly specialized qualifications in the field of gynecology and endocrinology was moved from the Federal Republic of Germany to Colombia under the organization's Return-of-Talent programme.

A special session of the ICM Council was held in Geneva during the period 1-3 July 1981 to review the organization's activities in the field of Transfer of Technology through Specialized Human Resources. At this session the Council recommended inter alia that ICM should strengthen its cooperation with developing countries in respect of these activities; give high priority to Return-of-Talent programming; and that the organisation should examine the possibility of extending these activities to other parts of the world, especially Africa and Asia.

ICM was invited to participate in a Ministerial Conference on Human Resources which was held in Monrovia, Liberia, from 5 to 8 October 1981 under the auspices of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA). The conference expressed concern over the gravity of the brain-drain from Africa and urged that ECA member states establish contact with ICM and examine the possibility for cooperation in promoting the return of more qualified African personnel to their homelands. Thus far three African countries, i.e. Cape Verde, Kenya and Somalia have established official ties with ICM for this purpose.

As a follow-up to the April Seminar mentioned on page 2, a workshop was staged in Thailand from 23 through 25 November to study specific problems of refugee women. The needs of refugee women were analyzed and evaluated, and model programmes were designed. Refugee women from different ethnic origins participated actively in the Workshop and came forward with significant ideas and proposals for services.

On the occasion of ICM's 30th anniversary, which was commemorated on 1 December 1981 during the regular annual session of the ICM Council, the organization received notable recognition from numerous esteemed personalities for its humanitarian achievements and valuable services toward socio-economic advancement in developing countries. During that same session, the Council approved the proposed Programme and Budget for 1982 totalling $133.2 million ($7.4 million for Administration and $125.8 million for Operations). The 1982 Programme projects the processing and movement of 192,900 refugees and national migrants.

In reviewing 1981, certain other events are notable:

The emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union was at a considerably reduced level. Arrivals in Vienna totalled only 9,460 of whom 1,790 proceeded to Israel and the others were transferred to Italy for resettlement processing to other countries. This rate contrasts with 21,470 arrivals in 1980, and 51,330 in 1979;

Some 1,500 African refugees from Botswana, Djibouti, Egypt, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan, Swaziland, Zaire and Zambia were processed and moved to resettlement countries outside Africa;

4,300 asylum-seekers in the Federal Republic of Germany were processed and either resettled in third countries or repatriated to their homelands;

In 1981, some 8,000 national migrants in Italy and Portugal, and refugees in Europe and S. E. Asia, attended ICM classes given in English, French and German. Video facilities were introduced in ICM's training programmes at Traiskirchen (Austria) and Latina (Italy). This was possible thanks to a much-appreciated donation by the Norwegian Refugee Council. In mid-December, an agreement was concluded between ICM and the Italian Ministry of Labour to provide language training in German for Italian hotel workers wishing to seek employment in the Federal Republic of Germany and Switzerland;

ICM joined with UNHCR and ICVA in creating an International Refugee Integration Resource Center; and

Owing to stringent economy measures ICM's administrative expenditures in 1981 were limited to $7.4 million, i.e. near zero growth as compared to 1980 in spite of the increasing cost of services. Similarly, operational expenses were kept to a minimum level due in large measure to favorable arrangements with the international airlines. ICM's total budget for 1981 amounting to $141.8 million was in balance at the year's end.

Geneva, January 11, 1982.●

FIREARMS OWNERS PROTECTION ACT

● Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring to your attention, and to the attention of my honored colleagues, an example of the kind of grassroots support S. 1030, the Firearms Owners Protection Act, is gaining nationwide. I joined my fellow Idahoan, Senator McClure, in sponsoring this legislation because of the clear necessity of focusing enforcement of Federal firearms law not on dealers and owners who have no intent of breaking any law, but on those who use firearms for the purpose of furthering or committing crime. Those who use firearms for lawful purposes wrongfully bear the blame for those who use firearms for criminal acts. Our law must emphasize the apprehension, prosecution, and punishment of those involved in such unlawful acts. It is heartening to have many diverse groups such as the Virginia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution recognize the need for this change in emphasis and I am pleased to bring their resolution on the McClure-Volkmer bill to the attention of the Senate.

I ask that the resolution be printed in the Record.

The resolution follows:

Resolution Regarding the 1968 Gun Control Act

Whereas, all offenses under the 1968 Gun Control Act are felonies; and

Whereas, "dealer" is not defined under such act; and

Whereas, many law-abiding citizens have been maltreated under the ambiguous provisions of the 1968 Gun Control Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Virginia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution endorses the efforts to enact the McClure-Volkmer bill which repeals the inequities and abuses of the 1968 Gun Control Act.●

COAL—PIPELINE

● Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in the last few weeks, two of our Nation's leading newspapers have editorialized in favor of Federal legislation for interstate coal slurry pipelines. On January 27, the Wall Street Journal ran an editorial entitled "Dampening the Coals." On December 27, the New York Times ran an editorial entitled "Unclog the Coal Pipeline."

Both of these editorials stress that interstate coal pipelines will provide much needed competition for our railroads. The rates that railroads charge for coal haulage have been effectively deregulated by the Staggers Rail Act of 1980. Much of our Nation's coal production is captive to the railroads—coal producers and coal users have no alternative but to ship their coal on the railroads at the haulage rates dictated by the railroads. Unless interstate coal pipelines are granted Federal eminent domain authority, the railroads will continue to block coal pipelines, all of which must cross railroad property at some point.

Both of these editorials stress that eminent domain for interstate coal pipelines is a Federal issue, not a State issue. As the Wall Street Journal notes, the western railroads, interstate natural gas pipelines, interstate petroleum pipelines, and interstate electric transmission lines have all been granted Federal eminent domain authority. The time has now come to grant the same authority to interstate coal pipelines.

The New York Times editorial sums up the issue nicely:

> It is hardly likely that slurry pipelines could grab all the coal traffic. They are likely, however, to cut into railroad profits on coal. And that is how free enterprise is supposed to work.

Mr. President, legislation granting Federal eminent domain authority for interstate coal pipelines is proceeding in the House. Seven of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring similar legislation in the Senate. I invite each of my colleagues to join us in sponsoring S. 1844, the Coal Distribution and Utilization Act of 1981, and in assuring that this important legislation is enacted at the earliest possible date.

I ask that both the Wall Street Journal editorial and the New York Times editorial be printed in the Record.

The articles follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 27, 1982]

Dampening the Coals

Coal mining concerns and the railroads are locked in a classic feud pitting the principles of the competitive free market against the protection afforded by government regulation. The issue is whether pipelines should be allowed to compete with the railways for the expanding coal transport market. The Reagan administration, it's sad to say, is moving along the wrong track in this dispute.

The vast bulk of U.S. coal is moved by rail, at no little expense. For instance, railway charges to ship a load of coal from a Wyoming mine to a Texas utility are now about four times the price of the coal itself. Coal producers complain that they are "captive customers" to the railroads and would like to see competition.

One idea, which dates back more than 90 years, is to move coal by pipeline. Coal can be ground and mixed with a liquid—water, oil, methanol or even liquefied carbon dioxide from the coal itself—and the resulting slurry can be pumped through underground pipelines to utilities, industrial users and ships for export. Besides helping to develop our coal reserves, slurry pipelines could also provide direct and indirect savings in transportation costs, according to a 1980 study commissioned by the Energy Department. "To the extent that the threat of slurry pipeline competition acts to keep rail rates low, then savings can result even if coal is hauled by rail," it concludes.

The only coal pipeline now in operation runs from Arizona to Nevada and carries 4.8 million tons a year at a cost estimated at less than half the comparable rail shipment. There are tentative plans for another eight slurry lines, with a total capacity of over 150 million tons annually. However, work on these pipelines is being impeded by two major obstacles: inability to gain rights-of-way across the country's vast web of railway lines and the question of water availability in the West.

The federal government granted eminent domain authority to the railroads in the 1860s and 1870s to allow them to traverse land and thus to facilitate the growth of the West. The railways are blocking the entrance of slurry pipelines into the coal transport market by refusing them rights-of-way across railway property. Similar railway recalcitrance led to federal rights-of-way for petroleum pipelines during World War II and eminent domain authority has also been given to interstate gas pipelines and electric power lines.

The Reagan administration was asked to support legislation in Congress last year to permit coal slurries to cross railway lines. But Interior Scretary James Watt said the administration would not support granting eminent domain authority to the coal pipelines because it would violate states' rights. Mr. Watt's explanation was, in a word, fallacious.

All but one of the planned slurry pipelines would cut across state lines and therefore come under direct federal jurisdiction as interstate commerce. Besides, the only reason the coal producers are in this fix is the federal privileges granted to the railroads in the first place. The responsibility for granting rights-of-way to these slurry lines rests solely and squarely with the federal government, not in the state capitals.

A states' rights issue does arise, however, over the question of water availability. Here the legislation would limit the federal government's authority and would in effect give the governors veto power over coal lines based on water scarcity. This doesn't seem to bother the coal producers much. They figure they can probably find other liquids such as oil to convey the coal through the pipelines.

What really seems to be on the administration's mind is the worry that support of eminent domain for coal pipelines would be perceived in the West as federal infringement in the sensitive area of water rights, even though this is not truly the case. So the administration drew back from the issue by making this false plea for states' rights. In the meantime coal producers must cope with transportation bottlenecks, and the railways are asking the Interstate Commerce Commission to lift price regulations on coal exports. This too has the coal mine companies up in arms.

Congress will soon have a chance to redress the balance. The House Public Works Committee soon will take up the pipeline issue. (The House Interior Committee has already approved the eminent domain legislation.) We hope that Congress shows more concern than the administration for introducing competition in the coal transport market and thus, it's hoped, encourages further development of our vast coal reserves

[From the New York Times, Dec. 27, 1981]

UNCLOG THE COAL PIPELINE

The standard way to move coal from mine mouth to power plant is by rail and barge. But it's not the only way. Pulverized and mixed with water, coal "slurry" can be efficiently moved by pipe, for hundreds or even thousands of miles.

Why, then, is there only one coal slurry pipeline in operation? Because the railroads have blocked other pipe construction by refusing to provide rights-of-way across their tracks. Eminent domain legislation, now pending in Congress, would break the rail monopoly and help hold down the cost of generating electricity.

Coal is a key to America's self-sufficiency in energy. It is abundant, cheap to mine and, when burned with care, relatively benign to the environment. Railroads, supplemented by river barges, could probably meet any increase in the demand for coal transport. But without effective competition, the high cost of moving coal by train over long distances is bound to retard the coal revolution. That's where slurry fits in.

Three planned pipelines would move low-sulfur coal from the northern plains to sourthern cities now dependent on natural gas. One would feed Appalachian coal to power plants in Florida. And three others would serve the export trade, bringing fuel to the ports of Norfolk, Los Angeles and Portland.

The opposition in the plains states comes from farmers and ranchers, who fear competition for scarce but low-priced water. Their complaints have impressed the Reagan Administration, which opposes the pending Federal law on the pretext that interestate energy commerce should be left to the states. But the slurry companies are confident that entrenched water interests can be bought off. The more serious opposition comes from railroads.

Until last year the railroads had a good case. Unsympathetic regulators prevented them from making a profit on most freight; their virtual monopoly in the coal traffic was often the only thing that kept them from bankruptcy. But regulatory reform has now given the railroads the rate flexibility they need to survive. There is every reason to let pipelines begin to compete.

The bills submitted to the House and Senate would still require pipeline developers to make their peace with individual states on water and environmental issues. But they would pre-empt for the Federal Government the authority to require the railroads to sell their rights-of-way for slurry operations.

It is hardly likely that slurry pipelines could grab all the coal traffic. They are likely, however, to cut into railroad profits on coal. And that is how free enterprise is supposed to work.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATIONS BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

● Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this notice of Senate employees who propose to participate in a program, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received requests for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Ms. E. Diane Lifsey and Ms. Patricia J. Buckheit of the staff of Senator GLENN, Mr. Tom Palmerlee of the staff of Senator WALLOP, and Mr. James H. Dykstra of the staff of Senator COHEN, to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign education organization, Tamkang University in Taipei, Taiwan, from January 3 to 11, 1982.

The Committee has determined that participation by Ms. Lifsey, Ms. Buckheit, and Messrs. Palmerlee and Dykstra in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of Tamkang University, to discuss Taiwanese culture and institutions, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received requests for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Craig Lovitt of the staff of Senator DIXON Mr. Joseph E. diGenova of the staff of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and Ms. Victoria Toensing of the staff of the Select Committee on Intelligence, to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, Tunghai University in Taichung, Taiwan, in early January 1982.

The committee has determined that participation by Messrs. Lovitt and diGenova and Ms. Toensing in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of Tunghai University, to discuss Taiwanese culture and institutions, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination that will permit Senator GRASSLEY to participate in a program on economic and cultural issues sponsored by the Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce in Taiwan in late December 1981.

In addition, the committee has received a request for a determination that will permit Senator MURKOWSKI to participate in a program on alternative energy sources sponsored by the Solar Energy Society of the Republic of China in Taiwan from January 18 to 23, 1982.

The committee has determined that their participation in these programs, at the expense of the sponsoring organizations, is in the interests of the Senate and of the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received requests from Senators CHAFEE and DANFORTH for a determination under rule 35 which would permit them to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, the Japan Institute for Social and Economic Affairs, in Tokyo, Japan, from January 7 to 14, 1982.

The committee has determined that participation by Senators CHAFEE and DANFORTH in the program in Tokyo, at the expense of the Japan Institute for Social and Economic Affairs, to discuss economic and social issues affecting United States-Japanese relations, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Don Massey, a member of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, Tamkang University School of American Studies in Taipai, Taiwan, from January 3 to 11, 1982.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Massey in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of

Tamkang University, to discuss matters of mutual interest and international relations, is in the interests of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Casimir Yost, of the staff of Senator MATHIAS, to participate in an international visitors program of the Government of France, sponsored by the Government of France, from January 7 to 17, 1982, in France.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Yost in the program in France, at the expense of the French Government, to discuss foreign and defense policy issues, is in the interests of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Herman Pirchner of the staff of Senator JEPSEN, to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, Tamkang University in Taiwan from January 3 to 11, 1982.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Pirchner in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of the Tamkang University, to discuss Taiwanese culture and institutions, is in the interests of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Dr. Christopher Chamberlin of the staff of Senator TSONGAS to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, Tunghai University in Taichung, Taiwan, from January 5 through 12, 1982.

The committee has determined that participation by Dr. Chamberlin in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of Tunghai University, to discuss Taiwanese culture and institutions, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Ms. Margo Carlisle of the staff of Senator MCCLURE, and Mr. Joel S. Lisker, chief counsel and staff director of Senator DENTON's Judiciary Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism, to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, the Fundacion Argentina 2000, and a domestic nonprofit educational foundation, the Institute of American Relations, in Buenos Aires, from December 1 to 4, 1981.

The committee has determined that participation by Ms. Carlisle and Mr. Lisker in the program in Argentina, at the expense of Fundacion Argentina 2000 and the Institute of American Relations, to discuss recent events in the Caribbean and Central America and the security problems of the southern Atlantic, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Robert Atchison, of the staff of Senator MATTINGLY, to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, Tamkang University in the Republic of China, in early January 1982.

The committee has determination that participation by Mr. Atchison in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of Tamkang University, to discuss Taiwanese culture and institutions, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The Select Committee on Ethics has received a request for a determination under rule 35 which would permit Mr. Ryan Conroy, of the staff of Senator CRANSTON, to participate in a program sponsored by a foreign educational organization, Tunghai University in Taichung, Taiwan, from January 5 to 13, 1982.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Conroy in the program in Taiwan, at the expense of Tunghai University, to discuss Taiwanese culture and institutions, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, 64 years ago the strong and courageous people of the Ukraine reclaimed the independence which had been wrested from them nearly 300 years earlier. It was little more than 5 years ago that 10 Ukrainians, in the face of harassment and repression in their native land, issued the declaration of implementation of the Helsinki accords, better known as the Ukrainian Helsinki group. It is fitting that today, as we honor the declaration of Ukrainian independence in 1918, we should pay special tribute to the men and women of the Ukraine who are carrying forward, at great personal sacrifice, the quest for human liberty. The courageous spirit of the Ukrainian people is as strong today as in 1918, and indeed throughout the centuries of Ukrainian history.

Since the historic date in 1918 when the Ukrainians declared their independence day, much has been accomplished worldwide to insure respect for fundamental human rights. Sadly, however, we are struck today with a deep sense of concern as our hearts and minds turn to those in the Ukraine who continue to endure without freedom.

In our efforts on behalf of human rights we find leadership and inspiration in those who, at great personal cost, have lived courageously by the principles which they espouse—Valentin Moroz, Petro Vins, Lev Lukyanenko, Mykola and Raisa Rudenko. Their names are well known to us. Countless others whose names we do not always know have joined them in openly protesting cultural oppression, religious persecution, and economic exploitation, and like them many have gone to prison for daring to express their most deeply held convictions. Their extraordinary efforts have the support of our own great and free nation of countless dedicated Ukrainian Americans, and indeed of all Americans who cherish the blessings of freedom.

As we pay tribute to this heroic devotion to freedom, we are also aware of the hundreds of thousands of Americans of Ukrainian descent who have made valuable contributions to the growth of America. The Ukrainian immigrant distinguished himself not only by his hard work and intelligence but also by his constructive citizenship and sense of justice. Ukrainian Americans have contributed to the economic and cultural development of America through their participation in the arts, science, politics, business, and other endeavors.

We in Maryland are very fortunate to have a large and active Ukrainian-American community. Ukrainians in Maryland through their stable family life, their sense of community responsibility and their social and religious activities have greatly enriched the life of our State.

As we salute the achievements of the Ukrainian people in their anniversary year, we also renew our commitment to speak out on behalf of those who suffer deprivation under a government which continues to deny basic human rights.●

SPEECH BY JAMES D. ROBINSON III, THE CHAIRMAN OF AMERICAN EXPRESS, ON U.S. TRADE IN SERVICES

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, on January 21, 1982, Mr. James D. Robinson III, the chairman of American Express, gave a speech at the National Press Club on the problems facing the U.S. services industry. Mr. Robinson's speech emphasizes the need to reexamine all economic indicators to reflect the fact that service industries now employ more than 70 percent of all Americans and contribute two-thirds of our gross national product. Additionally, Mr. Robinson's speech correctly points to the need to recognize the importance of service industries in our trade policy in light of the fact that in 1981, the service industry was responsible for the first overall surplus in our balance of payments since 1976.

To insure the continued health of U.S. service industries, Mr. Robinson advocates a four-point-action plan which calls for: First, an increase in the visibility of the issue of trade in services; second, efforts to insure that U.S. laws and economic and monetary policy take full account of the service sector's importance in the American economy; third, reform of our international trade legislation to deal with service problems; and fourth, the negotiation of an international agreement on trade in services.

As a member of the Finance Subcommittee on International Trade, I intend to promote Mr. Robinson's four-point plan and make trade in services one of my priorities during the remainder of this session of Congress. I will also encourage the administration, through the introduction of legislation and other means, to make trade in services a focal point of U.S. trade policy, Mr. Robinson's speech is an effective statement of the importance of focusing on the problems faced by the U.S. services industry.

I commend it to my colleagues and ask that it be printed in the Record.

The speech follows:

Remarks to National Press Club

I'm honored to be at this most notable Washington forum, and pleased to be here at the beginning of a New Year. It's a good time for reflecting on the past—and looking toward the future.

I can't think of a better time to talk about a fundamental and profound change that has taken place in the dynamics of our economy; the shift from a manufacturing economy to one dominated by services.

Today, I want to examine the implications of this shift on our domestic and international economic, monetary and trade policies. And I also want to stress the necessity of broadening our vision to reflect this unalterable change in our economic life.

In my judgment, if we fail to take account of today's realities, we may find ourselves behaving like generals preparing for yesterday's war. We are in danger of addressing—inadequately—economic problems of the 1980s with assumptions and perceptions of decades past.

Let me be more specific.

In the last few years, we have seen a new slogan rise to importance: Reindustrializing America. Two Presidents as different as Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan have embraced the idea—as a way to provide more jobs, to cure productivity problems and to make America more competitive in world markets.

Of course they are right. We do need more modern plants, better technology, more productive factories. Reindustrialization is necessary—urgently necessary. But it will not be sufficient alone.

Why? Because in recent years our American economy, for the second time in two centuries, has been transformed.

The nineteenth century, as you know, brought our first great transformation: from an economy dominated by agriculture to one dominated by industry—by manufacturing and mining.

Now the mid-twentieth century has brought another transformation—from an economy driven by manufacturing, mining and farming to one in which services are centrally important.

What's included in that catch-all term, "services"? A great deal:

Your local bank or thrift institution, your insurance agent, stockbroker, lawyer and doctor, for example.

Hotels, restaurants, airlines and railroads are services.

The exploding information industry—data processing, software development, news gathering, publishing and broadcasting are services.

Advertising, real estate, engineering, retailing, education—all these belong to the service sector. So does government.

To sense the magnitude of this change, you need only glance at the first chart we have left at your places. It's the pie chart with the heading "Composition of Gross National Product." Let me invite your attention to the dramatic story it illustrates.

In 1979—the latest year for which we have full information—manufacturing represented 23 percent of our GNP.

The farming slice was 3.2 percent; mining, 2.9 percent.

Services, however, constituted 66 percent—two thirds—of our economic pie.

More than seven out of every 10 American workers are employed in services. In this city where majorities really count, that fact bears repeating. More than seven out of 10 American workers have jobs in services.

And services are not just important in our domestic economy. The second chart at your places—"The Growing Importance of the U.S. Export Sector"—shows how crucial exports have become, in recent years, to our prosperity. Over the past 20 years they have doubled as a percentage of GNP.

Chart Three—"U.S. Balance of Payments Trade in Goods and Services"—shows the growing contribution of the service sector to our international balance of payments. Over the past 10 years, our balance of payments in services has been growing steadily—while the balance for goods has been declining. And our trade in services was responsible for the first overall surplus since 1976.

I need not tell you that without that surplus interest rates—and inflation—might well be even higher.

So services are a growing force in world trade. In fact, they now account for 20 percent of all world trade. And the United States is the world's largest exporter of services; last year, for example, from advertising to insurance to health care, our exports amounted to at least $60 billion.

Now, with that general perspective, may I ask you to put the charts aside, and I will focus on the implications of this growth in services.

In fact, it is a sign of America's economic vitality and creativity.

Are service workers productive? Yes. Between 1967 and 1979, for example, productivity in goods increased by 10 percent. Productivity in services, however, increased by 20 percent. This was especially true in information-related businesses because of the revolution in computers and telecommunications.

In spite of this increase in worker productivity, the service industry has been a strong source of new jobs. Job growth in the service sector, in fact, is growing twice as fast as employment in manufacturing.

When it comes to job creation, by the way, it's interesting to consider facts like these: restaurants and hotels are especially important sources of jobs for minorities and women. For both, employment in tourism is high compared to other industries, particularly in our large cities.

Service workers are skilled. Increasingly so. The technological revolution requires legions of highly educated, trained and sophisticated employees.

The evidence suggest, moreover, that service industries contribute to the stability of our economy. Consumer spending for services, for example, appears to be less vulnerable to recession than other sectors of the economy. During the recession of 1974-75, consumer spending for durable goods dropped by nearly eight percent. But personal spending for services grew by more than two percent.

All of this is good news for our economic policymakers. It suggests that the service sector, while it deals with invisibles and intangibles, does *not* deal in inconsequentials.

In fact—and this is the icing on the cake—services increase the productivity of manufacturing industries. They make industrial production and international trade more effective. Banks, brokers, insurance carriers . . . employment, travel, and advertising agencies . . . all these and other services promote the flow of goods.

A generation ago, the dominant symbol of economic America was the smokestack. Today another symbol has earned a place beside the smokestack: the humming computer. Both are essential. Both work together. Each needs the other.

All this vitality, growth and dynamism suggest to me—and I hope you—that the growth of services is a positive trend.

But we are not acting at present as if we fully understand what services can mean to our domestic economy and our international trade. We have not fully grasped the implications of this profound shift on the way we measure, record, evaluate and manage our economic health.

In fact, we often behave as if the service sector doesn't exist; it's as if we look at our economy with only one eye—the industrial eye—when we should be using two. We need to open the services eye, so that we can see our economy in its entirety.

Test your own thinking to guage what I mean.

When you think of unemployment, do you think—first—of factory unemployment?

When you think of tax depreciation and other incentives for investment in plant and equipment, do you think—first—of industrial plant and equipment?

When job training and vocational education are mentioned, do you think—first—of training for assembly-line jobs?

If so, you're not alone. Many of our lawmakers and policymakers have been thinking the same way. And so our tax laws, our employment and training programs, our economic policies, our plans to improve productivity simply don't take adequate account of the service industries, of their importance—and their rich potential—and of their unique characteristics, especially as they relate to job creation.

In my judgment, it's timely and imperative that we review our whole range of domestic economic policy—with an eye to recognizing the importance and the promise of the service industries.

The point is this: If we persist in viewing our economy through that single industrial eye, we will find ourselves misperceiving economic reality.

Two Sundays ago, for example, Norman Robertson, chief economist of the Mellon National Bank, said it was misleading to base predictions of the current recession on manufacturing data alone.

In an article which pointed out that ". . . Car sales, housing construction and overall industrial production are all depressed," Mr. Robertson was quoted as saying, "the service industry, which has grown over the years to account for 72 percent of nonfarm employment, is less sensitive to high interest rates and remains strong."

"Service," he went on "is not adequately expressed in the monthly parade of data . . ." Too heavy a reliance on inventories as an economic indicator may distort economic policy and business calculations.

On this subject of indicators, let me raise another issue. Outmoded or inappropriate indicators may contribute to bad policy. This is true in the service sector. It is also true for monetary policy. The basis for executing monetary policy these days—the reliance on M1 as the key indicator of the money supply—is outmoded, in my view. This may, in part, explain our volatile and excessively high interest rates. The consequence is an inordinate crippling of the manufacturing and housing sectors. In many respects, it appears that assumptions about the economy and monetary policy are based on an industrial economy rather than a service-dominated economy.

Let me assure you that I am not alone in my concern about monetary indicators. In remarks delivered on December 28th, Tony Solomon, President of the New York Fed, pointed out the inadequacy of present money supply measures and advocated redefinition. I advocate a total review not only of money supply measures but of all our economic indicators to reflect the economy as it is, not as it was.

Now let me turn to the implications of services in world trade.

In the past, our foreign trade policy has been targeted on one goal: to promote the export of our manufactured goods and to deal with the problem of foreign manufacturers invading vulnerable domestic markets.

In my judgment, we need to broaden our trade objectives. We need to focus on barriers that confront our exports of services, as well.

The potential for growth in U.S. services exports is tremendous—as long as foreign markets remain open. But barriers—both visible and invisible—to trade in services are in place and are growing. As the world economy undergoes serious strains, these barriers will multiply.

What are these barriers? They are so numerous and varied that they almost defy classification. But it is interesting to mention just a few of them:

The U.S. shipping industry encounters discriminatory regulations when seeking the right to transport foreign cargoes. This has been extremely costly to U.S. flag carriers.

U.S. airlines must compete with subsidized foreign carriers. They also have to contend with exorbitant landing fees, less favorable ground handling treatment, discriminatory restrictions on airport use and even denial of access to airline reservation systems.

In many countries, administrative delays make operating licenses difficult if not impossible to obtain. Norway has not licensed a foreign insurance firm in the past four decades.

Several countries impose discriminatory taxes on the importation of U.S. films, other countries prohibit the establishment of foreign banks or subject them to prohibitive currency and operational restrictions. The list goes on and on.

Another potentially threatening and disruptive barrier is restrictions on what we call transborder data flows—that is, the flow of information across national borders.

By linking computers to our telecommunications networks, we have gained the ability to transmit heavy volumes of information quickly and cheaply by satellite or microwave relay. Such rapid data transfers across national boundaries and across oceans have become commonplace—and vital to businesses, domestic and foreign.

But now, in Europe and elsewhere, efforts are underway to impede the free flow of such flashes of information.

France, for example, has under discussion a proposal to set a value and impose a duty on imported computer software.

Canada's new Bank Act mandates data be maintained and processed in Canada, and;

The Japanese refused an American data-processing company, access to leased lines necessary for its business.

Such barriers are a problem now; they could become a crisis in the future. For example, there are countries which are beginning to regard information as "national property", and are moving to restrict the dissemenation of their "national property". Obviously, this could become a serious problem for freedom of the press.

So a large part of my purpose in Washington today is to sound a loud and determined alert to: (1) The importance of services in the national economy; (2) The importance of services to our international trade; and (3) The significance of services to our national economic and monetary policy, and the opportunities they represent.

What, exactly, should we be doing?

Our first necessity, in my judgment, is to raise the issues of services—and trade in services—to higher public visibility. That's why I'm here!

So I invite your help in telling the public what's happening and what's at stake in this emerging issue. I recognize these perceptions aren't going to change overnight. But there are a number of initiatives under way. One is from the service sector itself, which is beginning to recognize its many common interests.

Indeed, last week, a group called the Coalition of Service Industries, which includes American Express, announced its formation and its plans to sound the trumpet on service issues. One of the coalition's key supporters is former trade representative Bob Strauss—who is not known for being shy and retiring.

Second, we need to ensure that our laws take full account of the service sector's importance in our economy.

To this end, I would commend to your study a piece of pending legislation, the Service Industries Development Act. It is sponsored in the Senate by Senators Pressler and Inouye and in the House by Congressman Pete Stark. This legislation aims at increasing the government's commitment to the service sector and improves the statistics we so vitally need to effectively develop and execute policy.

Third, we need to reform our international trade legislation to deal with service problems. Existing U.S. trade legislation is incomplete. Our trade officials, at present, lack sufficient authority to confront discrimination against our service industries abroad. Important legislation will soon be introduced by Senators Chaffee and Roth, which will give services appropriate parity with manufactured goods in U.S. trade law. I strongly commend this legislation to your attention.

Fourth and finally, we need to spotlight services in U.S. trade policy, and to pursue serious negotiations aimed at free and fair trade in services.

On this point, I am more optimistic than ever before. President Reagan's Special Trade Representative, Bill Brock, is pressing this issue actively in both national and international forums.

The Administration, moreover, has pledged to give high priority to service trade issues.

An important forum for negotiations are the bilateral and multilateral arenas—and the Administration is preparing the ground for future international negotiations. One crucial event in this connection will be the gathering of trade ministers this fall in Geneva. Under the auspices of "GATT", it will be the first time in nearly a decade that officials at the ministerial level have sat down together to focus on key issues in world trade. In our view, service issues must be on their agenda. We need to insist that barriers to trade in services get the same attention that has been given in the past to barriers against trade in goods.

Ladies and gentleman, today the United States stands at the leading edge of the world's great technological and economic revolution. We have the world's most dynamic, productive and competitive service sector. Can we maintain this fortunate position? That is what is at stake. If we hope to, we must first understand that while manufacturing, mining and farming remain deeply important to our economic foundation, increasingly, we live in the house of services.

My friends, let's keep both our eyes open so that we see our economy as it really is—and act accordingly. In closing, I want to say what a pleasure it has been for me to address this audience—you who are so vital a part of our service sector.

Thank you.●

THE MUSIC EDUCATORS NATIONAL CONFERENCE

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it seems that music, in one form or another, is very much a part of each of us. For some who have mastered the ability to write music, or the art of playing an instrument, or the joy of singing a song, it represents the flourishing of a talent which can bring out the best in ourselves and our fellowmen. For others, who prefer to listen to the accomplishments of talented musicians, it represents uplift, enjoyment, and fulfillment.

We are, to a certain extent, the products of our environment, and our beliefs and our values, all of which are influenced by our music. Our ancestors were encouraged by ballads and songs which have been handed down for generations. In times of hardship, music can lend strength. In times of challenge, it can lend inspiration. Music can calm the soul; it can instill a sense of purpose of incite action for a cause. A masterpiece is timeless and provides a common thread from generation to generation and from society to society.

I am indebted to those who have helped to make music so much a part of our lives. Especially am I indebted to those who have dedicated themselves to teaching music to our children and to our peers. With such efforts, music in our schools has enabled virtually every person to have the opportunity to develop a talent in this area, or at the very least, appreciate, and be enriched by the music of others. Such has been the role of the Music Educators National Conference, which has grown from a humble beginning of 69 founders in 1907 to a membership of 60,000 in 1981. I am impressed with the wide scope of their influence for excellence in music. I offer my congratulations and gratitude to this group for their attainments which have produced added dimension to individual and group performance, knowledge and aesthetic fulfillment.

The Music Supervisors National Conference was founded on April 12, 1907 in Keokuk, Iowa as a means of getting school music teachers together to discuss common problems and search for workable solutions. Philip C. Hayden—a music supervisor in Keokuk—had devised a unique method for teaching rhythm to gradeschool children, and he wanted to invite a few friends to see his method in action and to offer some constructive criticism for improving it. Over a hundred music teachers responded to his call and went to Keokuk, April 10-12, 1907. Sixty-nine of them thought the get together sufficiently worthwhile to merit a permanent organization for future meetings.

From those humble beginnings in a small Midwestern town on the Mississippi River, the Music Educators National Conference has grown to its present size of nearly 60,000 members. The name was changed in 1934, reflecting the wider interests and responsibilities of the membership. The field of music education has progressed to where it now encompasses general and performance classes in elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education throughout the country.

In 1932, on the occasion of the Conference's Silver Anniversary, President Herbert Hoover wrote to convey "my sense of great cultural importance of the work of music teachers in the life of the people of the United States." In 1961, President John F. Kennedy spoke at a White House concert of school musicians:

> I think that sometimes in this country we are not as aware as we should be of the extraordinary work that is being done in dozens of schools stretching across the United States—schools where devoted teachers are studying with interested young men and women and opening up the whole wide horizon of serious music.

For 75 years, the Music Educators National Conference has served as the principal forum for people from every state in the Nation to share their ideas, their problems, and their enthusiasm for and about music and education. The resulting enrichment of individual minds and spirits has been reproduced in improved teaching and learning of music to greater and greater numbers of students.

At the Nashville meeting of the conference in 1922, Frank A. Beach of Emporia, Kans., summed up the goals of the organization when he said in his presidential address: "More music in education, more education in music." Great debates about the proper ways to achieve this goal have stimulated conference proceedings ever since. In times of trial in the 1930's, the conference resolved "that our emphasis in school music, both urban and rural, should be on its rich contribution to the finer human qualities and to morale."

In the spring of 1941, when the Nation was just becoming involved in the Second World War, MENC strongly encouraged music teachers to help build "a state of mind and heart that will meet with courage and loyalty any challenge to the American way of life." In 1956, on the occasion of the coming golden anniversary, Lilla Belle Pitts expressed the sense of the conference:

> We believe that music has a special mission in a world torn with anxiety and doubt, dissention and fear; in a world in danger of being dehumanized and disillusioned by materialism, mechanization and skepticism.

The Tanglewood declaration of the conference in 1968 affirmed the belief that "education must have as major goals the art of living, the building of personal identity, and nurturing creativity." The MENC exhorted its membership to:

> Accept the responsibility for developing opportunities which meet man's individual needs and the needs of a society plagued by the consequences of changing values, alienation, hostility between generations, racial and international tensions, and the challenges of a new leisure.

In a recent discussion of general music, current president, Mary E. Hoffman of Illinois, said:

> American schools have exposed more children to the loveliness that our art form represents than through any other form of music instruction. We are musical missionaries to children. We believe so strongly in children that we allow them to come to us whether they have talent or not.

The Music Educators National Conference has grown through the past 75 years just as the Nation has grown. Through world wars, economic hardship and depression, political disillusionment, social strife, and technological innovation, the conference has not only survived but triumphed because it has held fast to the democratic ideals which are so essential to our society. "Music for Every Child, and Every Child for Music" is more than a slogan of the conference. It bespeaks a commitment of nearly 60,000 American men and women to teaching music to boys and girls, to young and old, to black and Hispanic, to normal and handicapped, to rich and poor, to talented and ordinary, and to enthusiastic and hostile students. There is little reason to doubt an even greater celebration at the centennial of the conference in 2007.●

REMEMBERING F. D. R.

● Mr. HART. Mr. President, in 2 days it will have been a century since the birth of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Today we take time to praise his character, his strength, and his courage, and to remember the contributions of this man who indelibly marked our national and personal histories.

The era into which F. D. R. was born was a complex time: The closing of the American frontier, urbanization, a widening rift between rich and poor, the emergence of strong labor unions, increased regulation of business and transportation, and increased Government commitment to social welfare.

The Nation was experiencing massive change in its social and economic character. Into this context came a person who, in his childhood, would be sheltered from the inequities and adversities that accompanied such change, but who possessed and extraordinary capacity for adaptation, innovation, and flexibility. Born in a time of changes, he went on to become a force behind great changes as he conquered the grave problems facing our Nation.

Others might have been confounded by the conditions challenging F. D. R. on his first inauguration—nearly one-third of the Nation unemployed, banks devastated, morale low—these demanded a rare and strong figure. Their very nature might have broken the resolve of one bound by prescribed methodology or dogma. F. D. R.'s leadership in that difficult time however was grounded in a belief in creative ideas over rigid ideology. Stubborn absolutism never got in Roosevelt's way. As he stated in 1940,

> Eternal truths will be neither true nor eternal unless they have fresh meaning for every new social situation.

Roosevelt's leadership combined flexibility with a solid sense of what was right, and perhaps that mixture was the key to his achievements. A sense of adventure tempered by a deep belief in his responsibility to fellow human beings. Willingness to admit fault and resistence to dogma or rigid structure left him open to experimentation. In his words, what worked was "bold, persistent experimentation. It is commonsense to take a method and try it; if it fails, admit if frankly and try another. But above all, try something."

F. D. R. was never afraid to try anything new. But sheer experimentation for the sake of it was not what he valued. F. D. R. did not see experimentation as an end in itself, and never lost sight of the desired solution to whatever problem he was confronting.

We respect Roosevelt for the challenges he overcame and for his unfailing confidence, humor, and strength. In paying tribute to this great man, perhaps it is appropriate to use his own words, included in a speech he was to give on April 13, 1945, the day after he died. They seem to embody the sense of unlimited possibility and hope he conveyed and truly acted upon:

> The only limit to our realization of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

Let us remember his words and inimitable spirit as we commemorate the birthday of Franklin D. Roosevelt.●

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA HAS OUTSTANDING RECORD IN STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT

● Mr. EAST. Mr. President, the refusal by some to repay student loans is of great concern to me, but out of the State of North Carolina comes some news that is heartening.

I received a letter from Dean B. D. Barker of the School of Dentistry at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His school has achieved an outstanding record in loan repayment.

Mr. President, I ask that his letter be printed in the Record.

The letter follows:

The University of North
Carolina
at Chapel Hill,
Chapel Hill, N.C., December 23, 1981.
Senator John East,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator East: Several weeks ago Senator Charles Percy of Illinois raised the issue of physicians repaying health profession student loans. The resulting news accounts did not present a very attractive picture in behalf of health professionals in this country.

This incident caused us to ask for a full review of the repayment patterns of graduates of the University of North Carolina School of Dentistry, many of whom have received funding through the Health Professions Student Loan Program.

The present status of loan repayments by former dental students to the university's health professions student loan account is generally good. While we do not have immediate access to repayment information by former dental students on their loan accounts we expect that the health professions data is representative of those.

As of November 13, 1981 of 352 loans in repayment status, only 17 are delinquent. Three of the delinquencies are by students who did not complete the D.D.S. program. Small but insufficient payments are being made on a small number of the remaining 14 delinquent loans. In dollars, $17,692.52 in principal due is delinquent, out of $572,763.24 total outstanding in repayment, for a loan delinquency rate of 3.088. My understanding is that a flat 3% delinquency rate is considered outstanding in the banking industry.

While I wish the record were perfect, we take pride in the overall performance of the dental graduates of this institution. I thought you might be pleased to have this information, especially since over 80% of our graduates are North Carolinians.

Sincerely,

Ben D. Barker, *Dean.*●

64TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 64th anniversary of the establishment of the independent State of Ukraine.

We in America have enjoyed freedoms that others in the world strive for. The struggle of the Ukrainan people for freedom is a struggle that continues today. Our warm wishes for these noble people are richly deserved.

Last year, Dr. Mary V. Beck, a longtime resident of Michigan and the first woman to serve on common council of the city of Detroit, gave a speech entitled "The Gift of Freedom." I request that her moving and eloquent remarks be included in the Record so they may be shared with all Americans.

The remarks follow:

The Gift of Freedom

(This address was delivered by Dr. Mary V. Beck, the Executive Director of the Ukrainian Information Bureau of Detroit, Michigan, at the annual Ukrainian Day Program, sponsored by the Minneapolis Branch of The Ukrainian Congress Committee on Sunday, the 23rd day of August, 1981, in Minneapolis, Minnesota.)

Freedom is one of the most precious blessings bestowed upon mankind, for without it there can be no real hope for spiritual and material growth nor any real opportunity for achieving the goals of human welfare and human progress. Yet for those of us who have never been forced to live without freedom and who have never been shackled by the chains of oppression, freedom is a word that rarely stirs us to the very depths of our soul. It is only when we pause to remember and to recall the countless sacrifices that many men and women have made to attain, maintain or regain that freedom, does it become poignantly evident what a priceless treasure we, the fortunate ones, hold in our hands. Freedom is the heritage of all men, but not all men have been destined to enjoy it.

Freedom has flourished in America for more than two centuries and perhaps that is why so many of us take it for granted. When we commemorate our American Independence Day every July 4th, we do so with parades, bands, fireworks and other entertainment, designed to provide us with fun and merriment. That is commendable because it recreates to a certain extent the feeling and exuberance which must have been experienced by the eyewitnesses to the birth of this nation. But what is not commendable is the fact that, more often than not, forgotten and unmentioned are: the hardships, the grief the anguish, the misery, the human toil; in short, the inestimable price that was paid for that freedom by our American pioneers and patriots.

Would it not be desirable therefore, from time to time, to resurrect in our minds and to reflect upon the events and circumstances in which American freedom was spawned, in order to bring us to the realization of the truth, that freedom is not ours to have and to hold in perpetuity without constant vigilance and painstaking devotion; to motivate us into making periodic assessments of those forces, both external and internal, that may dissipate and destroy that freedom; and to bestir us to the regeneration of the kind of patriotism that would match the dedication of our founding fathers.

We, who are Americans by birth, have an unusual opportunity to learn the lesson of appreciation for freedom from those who became Americans by adoption and who were formerly bereft of that freedom. For are they not best qualified to make a genuine appraisal of the meaning and value of freedom? Many of the Americans by adoption are Ukrainian Americans, some of whom are here today, in our midst. Some of them have called this country home for thirty years and more, but they still bear the scars, if only faintly visible on their bodies but deeply etched in their minds and souls; scars of a life without freedom and invirtual enslavement.

Better than anyone else, they can depict for us the sheer rapture of living in a democracy, where for them an act of citizenship is not a boring chore but a unique privilege. Better than anyone else, they can relate what an overwhelming despair envelops a human being, when every aspect of his living and thinking is controlled and regulated. Better than anyone else, they can enlighten us about the insidious nature and menace of Communism coupled with Russian Imperialism. Better than anyone else they can attest to the determination of the Kremlin leaders to dominate the world and in the process of such endeavors, to "bury" this nation, which has become their public enemy No. 1. Better than anyone else they can make us understand the seriousness of the threat to the very survival of this American nation, remote and ridiculous as this may seem to the naive and the unthinking.

Freedom has not always flourished in the Ukraine, although its history which dates back to pre-Christian days, records several glorious periods of self-government and statehood. The latest of these occurred in the days following the end of the First World War, when the Russian and Austrian empires collapsed and made it possible for many subjugated peoples to arise and re-establish their independent governments. The Ukrainian National Republic, founded and fashioned on the precedent of traditional Ukrainian democracy, was thus formed on January 22, 1918, and one year later was joined by the Western Ukrainian National Republic to become a unified, independent and sovereign state. Unfortunately, the newly created Ukrainian National Republic endured only for three years, despite the heroic efforts of the Ukrainian people, their volunteer armies and their gallant leaders, to maintain it. The full story of the rise and fall of this republic is a tragic one and should be told at some time, for the enlightenment of posterity.

But today it should be noted that the Western Nations were slow to recognize the prospective value of an independent Ukraine in the balancing of powers and in the attaining of peace in Eastern Europe. Consequently they were also slow to offer any help to the Ukrainian people, who were besieged on all sides and forced to fight against their aggressive neighbors as well as the Bolsheviks who finally overpowered them and forced the annexation of the Ukrainian National Republic to the Soviet Union. As a result, for the past half century, the Ukrainian people have been and remain to this day, the victims of Russian tyranny. Yet their resistance, as much as it is possible in such a tightly controlled and highly repressed environment, has not ceased to manifest itself in many ways. Proof of this is the fact that, at this moment, thousands of Ukrainian political prisoners and dissidents are languishing in Soviet jails, in labor and prison camps and even in mental institutions, the most ingenious and at the same time, the most inhuman method of incarceration adopted by the Soviets.

Presently Ukraine, officially known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialistic Republic, with a population of approximately fifty million people, is nothing more than a colonial satellite of Moscow and its supposed status as an independent republic within the USSR, is pure unadulterated fiction. But it is not fiction that millions of Ukrainians have perished in this century alone, at the hands of their Russian overlords in the Kremlin. Many of them died on the battlefields because as Soviet citizens they were forced to fight on behalf of their oppressors rather than against them. But still more died in times of peace, as a result of illegal imprisonments, torture and mass executions. Seven million alone were deliberately starved to death in the Famine of 1933-34, which was premeditated and implemented by Stalin and his chieftains, solely for the purpose of decimating the Ukrainians. Others withered away in isolated exile in the wastelands of Siberia or found death through other forms of genocide initiated by their cruel masters. This untold martyrdom of the Ukrainians in their homeland did not, however, bring freedom within their grasp.

The world of tyranny and terror, although sometimes assuming the most sophisticated appearance, nevertheless spins on in the Soviet Union, engulfing not only

Ukraine but the other captive republics, who are contained in their allegedly independent governmental structures, as well. Ukraine, however, is singled out as a primary target because Ukraine is the largest, non-Russian republic, both in size and population, the wealthiest in natural resources and the most advanced in national awareness, thus posing the greatest internal threat to the continuation of the Russian dictatorship. Yet the Russian dictators fare well in their reign of oppression, because the Free World and too many of the Western leaders permit them to practice their excesses with complete impunity. Does not this reduce the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Accords to worthless paper and make a mockery of the much-touted detente? Did any of those international agreements deter the Soviets from violating the provisions contained therein, to the adherence of which they had committed themselves by affixing their signatures? Did they prevent them from invading Afghanistan or perpetrating their political mischief in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world, whether directly or by proxy with the help of the Cubans? Will those documents dissuade them from a military occupation of Poland, in order to extinguish the sparks of freedom engendered by the "Solidarity Union?" On the basis of past history, a decided no can be the only answer to those questions.

The world and its leaders are apprized of what is going on. So one begins to wonder why there is such a lack of desire, or should I call it lack of courage, to expose the Soviets for what they are—actual warmongers and not peacemakers or liberators of oppressed peoples. Why is it so difficult to reveal the truth about their ambitious goals and their readiness to achieve them at any cost, by any means, when it is this truth that can become our most effective weapon against them? It is this truth, therefore, that we must promulgate, but we must do so as relentlessly, as persistently and as convincingly as this greatest foe of freedom peddles his perfidious propaganda, his false slogans and his specious sweet-talk about brotherhood, justice, equality, freedom and peace.

Oh how that Soviet propaganda mill can grind out its pernicious pulp, seizing upon the smallest of incidents and making it a ploy in the greatest confidence game of all time! A striking current example comes to mind. You probably have in your hands a booklet distributed here today, titled "The Littlest Defector," pertaining to the matter of Walter Polovchak, the young Ukrainian lad who came with his parents from Ukraine to Chicago. The parents, after a lifetime of regimentation, lost the capacity to think and act for themselves and found it impossible to function in a free society. Disillusioned, they indicated a desire to return to the Soviet Union, but to their dismay, their 17-year-old daughter and their 13-year-old son, Walter, refused to go back. The daughter is considered an adult and permitted to make her decision. Walter, however, is a juvenile and the parents, undoubtedly prompted by their Soviet guardians, made a big issue of Walter's refusal to accompany them and resorted to the courts, where the matter is now pending on appeal. The parents finally returned to Ukraine just about a week ago, although previously the Soviets refused to allow them to return without Walter.

Walter remained in the U.S. as a ward of the Court, but his parents vow to continue the fight for the custody of their son, claiming that Walter was coerced by relatives to rebel against their parental authority through the use of drugs. But the Soviet government, which recognizes parental authority only theoretically, as so aptly pointed out in the booklet by S. Karavansky, is "tearing out its lungs and ripping out its heart" in its wild clamor and battle to regain a lost citizen, accusing the United States of kidnapping, violation of human rights as well as making other ridiculous and unsubstantiated charges, such as a purported offer by the U.S. to give the Polovchak family a $100,000 home and a good job, just to persuade them to remain in this country. Can any of us honestly believe that the U.S.S.R. is really so concerned about losing a 13 year old boy-citizen, when the Soviets have destroyed millions of people in establishing their communist empire and are destroying more every day in trying to maintain their despotic hold on their unwilling subjects? Of course not! They just found another golden opportunity to expose to the world one more "depraved deed of the imperialistic, capitalistic America."

Should it not be apparent by now, that not a single one of us, who cherishes freedom, can afford to remain silent, for as one wise man indicated: "Truth is not violated by falsehood alone, it is equally outraged by silence". There are those who are dying in the name of truth over there and elsewhere. We are not being asked to die for it. But we are being asked by those who are dying for it, merely to discern it, to disclose it and to disseminate it, so as to motivate people and nations to act in accordance with it. Shouldn't we keep reminding the Free World repeatedly of the enslavement of a quarter billion people by the rulers of one nation? Shouldn't we use the power of our word, if not the sword, the force of our moral courage, if not the force of our military might, the threat of a psychological war, if not the threat of a nuclear war, to decry every lie, to denounce every injustice and to condemn every crime committed by the Soviets against individuals or nations? Perhaps at last our officialdom has seen "the light of day" and has started on the right road, as currently manifested by President Reagan and his administration.

The message of truth about the Soviets should be circulated everywhere on this globe and part of that message should contain the truth about the plight of the long-suffering Ukrainians who are being crushed in the vise-like embrace of the Russian bear. That truth is somber but explicit: Ukraine is not free, although purported to be an independent and a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. Ukraine is not governed by her own people, but by the minions of Moscow. Ukraine is really nothing more than a colony; her people oppressed, her land ravaged, her natural resources exploited, her culture restricted, her language demeaned, her schools russified, her churches desecrated, her faithful believers persecuted, her intellectuals repressed, her history distorted, her national identity obscured and her very survival as a nation imperiled. This is the kind of a massive, body-enfeebling and soul-searing yoke that the Kremlin leaders have so cruelly imposed upon the Ukrainian people and other captive nations.

Is it any wonder therefore that American Ukrainians, who are living in this democracy, although agonizing over the fate of fellow-Ukrainians in their homeland, are continually expressing their gratitude for their own good fortune? For here, without fear, they can publicly express their love for their Ukrainian heritage which springs from their Ukrainian roots. Here they can acknowledge and practice the faith of their fathers, preserve and promote their culture, give free reign to their creative talents. Here they can rear their children in comparative safety and provide them with education and all the other benefits of a free society. Here they can also visually portray, as they are doing today, at this Ukrainian Day program, how a rich culture, prohibited from free development in the country of its origin, because of suppression, can virtually blossom in an adopted country, inspiring all citizens, both native and naturalized, into a heightened awareness of, and a deepening gratitude for, the gift of freedom.

Throughout their history, the Ukrainian people have felt a burning desire for freedom, waiting on one occasion as long as three centuries for its attainment, but steadfastly nurturing that desire and passing it on from generation to generation, until it became a radiant reality. This can and will happen again. For does not world history profusely illustrate that men can live in quiet desperation and endure inhumanity for a long, long time; but by the same token, men will not forever endure enslavement of the mind and spirit, and at a time, when least expected, from the very depths of their desperation they will miraculously summon up the will and the courage to rise up against their oppressors, even though the struggle may finally turn out to be futile and fatal. Moreover empires have crumbled before and empires will crumble again. But there will always be bearers of the torch of liberty, for as the great American philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson, once proclaimed: "The sun will be taken out of the skies before the love of freedom will be removed from the human breast."

This only confirms and strengthens the deeply entrenched belief of Ukrainians everywhere that we, and if not we, then those who will come after us, will one day again see the beautiful land of Ukraine liberated and free, and her people living joyfully in blessed peace and prosperity, just as we are living in this incomparable land of liberty, the United States of America.●

WINSTON-SALEM EXEMPLIFIES CULTURAL ACHIEVEMENTS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

● **Mr. EAST.** Mr. President, where some critics see a calamity in the reduction of Federal support for the arts, I see an opportunity to recover a part of our heritage. We should never forget that many of our most prominent cultural centers—the Metropolitan Opera, for example—were established by private philanthropy and sustained through civic pride long before Washington began handing out grant money.

The city of Winston-Salem, in my own State, offers a splendid example of the cultural achievements that can be attained at the local level. I recommend to my colleagues an excellent article on the subject that appears in the current issue of the Cultural Post, the quarterly publication of the National Endowment for the Arts.

I ask that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

WHEN IT COMES TO THE ARTS, WINSTON-SALEM MEANS BUSINESS

(By Stephen Sinclair)

It's got to be a conspiracy. Everyone you talk to in or about Winston-Salem, North Carolina, sounds like an avatar of civic pride and belief in the arts.

Take, for example, R. Philip Hanes, Jr., who may well be the chief conspirator. By lineage, breeding, and stated occupation (chairman of the Hanes Dye and Finishing Company), Hanes is a businessman, but clearly his real interest in life is running Ampersand, a public relations firm he founded to promote the arts of Winston-Salem. His chief clients are nonprofit operations: the Arts Council of Winston-Salem, the North Carolina School of the Arts, and the Southeastern Center for Contemporary Art (both located in Winston-Salem). He boasts of his 50-page-long computerized press list that has aided him in placing articles in, among other publications, the Financial Times of London, Rome's TV Guide, the Wall Street Journal, the Minneapolis Tribune, the National Journal (a weekly on politics and government published in Washington), and two articles each in U.S. News and World Report and Smithsonian since 1979. U.S. News quoted Hanes to the effect that Winston-Salem will become "the most important cultural city in the nation—including New York—in a decade or two."

Take also Susan Hollis, a graduate student in the history of architecture and urban development at Cornell University. In a paper delivered at Cornell's Conference on the Economic Impact of the Arts held last June, she concludes, "Success seems inevitable for Winston-Salem's overall downtown development. . . . There is widespread community support for the downtown arts complex, and in the central business district and center city neighborhoods there is a palpable sense of excitement and anticipation, of work being accomplished."

Take John Goyette, executive director of Spirit Square, the heart of a successful revitalization effort in downtown Charlotte, North Carolina, Winston-Salem's rival to the south. "They are doing something radical there," he says. "It is going to be a fabulous, broad-based effort with lots of activities that will spill over and feed into each other—the park, the Stevens Center, the visual arts center, all of it."

Take Joseph Abely, vice-chairman of R. J. Reynolds, the giant tobacco corporation headquartered in Winston-Salem. A self-styled corporate nomad, Boston-born Abely says that in proportion to the population, no city in the country matches this town of 145,000 in its interests in artistic development.

This is not to mention the expected enthusiasm of arts council board members and staff and arts school administrators. What's remarkable about these predictably enthusiastic arts advocates, however, is the consistency with which they tell the story of the arts in Winston-Salem and the unanimity of their belief that the best is yet to come.

But what, readers may by now be asking, is the excitement all about? Here's the broad outline of what's going on.

DOWNTOWN—THE PLACE TO GO

Both the Arts Council of Winston-Salem—a private, nonprofit corporation and the oldest local arts council in the nation—and the North Carolina School of the Arts—an arm of the North Carolina university system that specializes in teaching the performing arts to students from the seventh grade through college—decided about two years ago to move major parts of their operations into the decaying heart of downtown Winston-Salem. In the wake of their commitment have come planned business investments—office buildings, hotels, restaurants, and shops estimated at $65.5 million. Though extraordinarily fortunate, the convergence of the arts and business on downtown was not exactly fortuitous. In fact, Sam Stone, development director for the school, himself describes the process by which these decisions were made as "a conspiracy," albeit an open and benign one.

The council and the school each ended up downtown as a result of their own needs. When founded in 1965, the school took as its original campus a former high school. In the following seven years, dormitories and a new wing with studio and rehearsal space went up, but the school continued to lack a major hall. "A reasonable performing space is part and parcel of what a performing arts school ought to be," says Stone. "Not only for the performers, but for our technical students in the school of design and production. We wanted our future lighting and stage designers and managers to learn the ropes of operating in a theater that is technically sophisticated, so that when they go out into the theater world they'd be able to work in a Uris or a Metropolitan Opera House. Our current space—the old high school auditorium—is quite primitive and holds about 200 people."

The school investigated the possibility of building a new hall on its campus, but discovered that not only would the expense be prohibitive and the obliteration of the campus's little green space dispiriting, but that the school's location was the part of town least attractive to potential audiences.

Meanwhile, in 1972 to be exact, a splendid old downtown movie house called the Carolina closed its doors along with the Carolina Hotel, which inhabited the 11-story building above. Though the school contemplated purchase of the theater, the asking price was too high. Instead, the Carolina's next-door neighbor, the Piedmont Publishing Company, bought the building in the expectation of tearing it down and using the land as a parking lot for Winston-Salem's two daily newspapers.

The arts council also began to suffer growing pains. "We were getting very cramped in our headquarters at the Hanes Community Center," recalls Elizabeth Booke, president of the council in 1978. "We shared the center, which is located several miles from downtown, with the United Way and the Chamber of Commerce, and we found ourselves using broom closets for offices. The theater next door, where the children's theater and the little theater performed, was proving inadequate, even though it wasn't very old, and the orchestra was complaining about the old band shell in the park that it used in the summer. We realized that we had to do something to meet the needs of our programs, so we decided to do a self analysis."

The council called on its former director, Ralph Burgard, now and arts consultant based in New York, to develop a cultural action plan for Winston-Salem. Putting together a committee of 150 citizens that included government officials, minority groups, and corporate executives, as well as artists and upper-middle-class arts patrons, Burgard helped Winston-Salem come to the conclusion that the key to its cultural future lay in the downtown. (The plan also called for a new band shell and expansion of the community theater—both now accomplished.) This result coincided niftily with a Chamber of Commerce study that urged the city fathers to bring the downtown back to life—partly because it was "everybody's neighborhood" and partly for financial reasons: The one percent of Winston-Salem's land located in the central business district provided 20 percent of its work force's jobs and 30 percent of the city's tax base. An enlightened business community saw it's opportunity to use the arts for economic purposes and acted.

Piedmont Publishing donated the Carolina Theater building to the school of the arts on the condition that the school refurbish it as a modern, first-class performing arts theater. R. J. Reynolds bought and donated a former textile mill, located half a block from the theater, to the arts council. (It helped that virtually every officer in Reynolds' executive suite served on the board of one or more of Winston-Salem's arts organizations.) Known as the Sawtooth Building because of the unusual design of its roof, the mill is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The arts council also acquired a former Cadillac showroom next door to the Sawtooth. And, to complete its reclamation of virtually and entire block, the arts council persuaded the city council to surrender a metered parking lot so that the land could be developed into the city's first downtown park.

The school and arts council launched simultaneous fund-raising campaigns for the $13 million needed to convert the buildings and construct the park. Both projects were underwritten, partly by a $700,000 challenge grant from the Arts Endowment. Although costs have risen, the projects have continued to find sufficient funding.

The Carolina Theater—rechristened the Roger Stevens Center for the Performing Arts in honor of the head of Washington's Kennedy Center who, as a member of the school's board, has been an adviser on its artistic and financial develoment—is being turned into a 1,400 seat performing space not only for performing groups from the school—who expect to use the theater about 190 days of the year—but for booking professional out-of-town attractions. The school received an additional $500,000 challenge grant in 1981 to continue work on the theater. "We're deeply into audience develoment," reports Stone. "We are eager to become a reginal performing arts center and build up our profile as a reginal attraction. We won't be able to bring in the most costly attractions—we couldn't meet the fee of the Chicago Symphony, for instance—but we'd love to be able to get the Eliot Feld Ballet, or, say, John Housman's Acting Company. We're also working on an arrangement with Duke University in Durham and Spirit Square in Charlotte to form a sponsoring network so we'll have a larger booking capability and be more attractive to touring arts groups." The Stevens Center will open in spring 1983.

An haute cuisine restaurant will take over the corner of the building while the upper stories, Stone expects, will be devoted to condominium or rental housing developed by a profit-making firm. Both the restaurant and the apartments should yield some income for the school.

While the school continues to plan, however, Winston Square—the collective name for the park-Sawtooth Building-Cadillac showroom complex—is a reality. Opening this month, Winston Square contains the arts council and a few of its member organizations' offices, three exhibition galleries (the largest of which, the R. J. Reynolds Gallery, will house traveling exhibitions), a black-box theater for experimental and workshop pieces, a moderately priced restaurant, and—the centerpiece of the development—the Sawtooth Center for Visual Design.

An outgrowth of the Arts and Crafts Association, the center is the brainchild of artist Ray Pierotti, who took over as the head of the association last May. While continuing the association's traditional educational programs in the visual arts and crafts, the center will add a two-year, associate-degree program in the visual arts that will prepare students for a four-year degree specializing in a particular art form. "Our graduates will also be prepared to go into industry as beginning-level designers," Pierotti says. "Winston-Salem is the hub of this region's furniture and textile industries, the related plastics and metals manufacturing, and their advertising. The center's educational programs will provide career opportunities in these areas.

Because Winston-Salem also has operating tobacco factories and textile mills downtown, Pierotti also plans for the Sawtooth Center to be operating at all hours—"we'll have classes going two to four a.m. for swing shift workers"—to serve the community.

Adjacent to the Sawtooth is the park, complete with fountains, bridges, playgrounds, and a 2,000-seat amphitheater. "Family activities and outdoor activities are going to be very big in the '80s," predicts Milton Rhodes, the arts council's director. "This park is going to provide both of them, having free noontime and evening concerts as well as the more customary attractions of a park. We also expect the park and the Sawtooth Center—where people will be able to see artists and students at work—to draw audiences and participants for each other."

ATTRACTING THE DOLLARS

Rhodes hopes eventually to earn money for the council by charging for some concerts in the amphitheater and some exhibitions in the Reynolds Gallery.

So Winston-Salem's experiment in revitalizing its downtown through the arts is launched. The question now is whether it will succeed where urban renewal and a downtown shopping mall—both tried in the past—have failed. The $85.5 million commercial investment—headed by Reynolds Plaza at $34 million and including a $22.5 million Radisson Hotel, a $2.2 million Ramada Inn, and a $5 million retail mall called Brookstown Mill—bodes well, but Winston-Salem's boosters are not just sitting back and waiting for the returns. Phil Hanes explains the need for continuing publicity for Winston-Salem. "The People here may say the arts are nice, but they won't believe our arts are really important unless we get attention in the national press. It helps to keep up their enthusiasm. At the same time, we've now reached a point where we've got to reach beyond our local resources for support." To fill those 1,400 seats in the Stevens Center, to book those hotel rooms, to patronize those shops and restaurants, Winston-Salem needs for America to discover its glories.●

INDEPENDENCE OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, as I pointed out 2 days ago in my remarks on the continued independence of the Federal Reserve Board, the executive oversight provisions, S. 1080, the Regulatory Reform Act, that we will soon be considering, could drastically undermine the congressionally mandated independent status of independent regulatory agencies by bringing their major rulemaking activities under constant Presidential supervision. I intend to offer an amendment to the bill to avoid such a result, similar to the one I introduced in the Governmental Affairs Committee. My amendment was unanimously adopted, but dropped from the so-called consensus draft of the bill that will come up for floor action.

In establishing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Congress determined that the crucially important responsibility for insuring the safety of nuclear powerplants around the Nation should be housed in a technically oriented agency that would be insulated from day-to-day political supervision by executive branch officials. Section 624 of the Regulatory Reform Act, however, would fundamentally change this relationship by giving the President clear authority to scrutinize prepublication drafts of the NRC's major safety rulemakings and to insure NRC's compliance with Presidentially mandated cost-benefit standards. According to the Governmental Affairs Committee report on S. 1080, this latter authority could permit the President to tell NRC whether, and at what rate, it should discount the monetary costs of future injuries from nuclear powerplant accidents. Since avoiding these costs would be balanced against the current costs of new safety equipment regulations, the potential for Presidential interference with the independent exercise of NRC's technical judgment is obvious.

NRC has strongly objected to this alteration in its independent status in a letter to Chairman Roth of the Governmental Affairs Committee. I request that this letter be included in the Record.

The letter follows:

U.S. Nuclear
Regulatory Commission,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1981.

Hon. William V. Roth, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Governmental Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: By letter dated May 14, 1981, you requested the views of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on S. 1080. In addition, your letter of July 30, 1981 sought the Commission's views on the particular portion of that bill, Section 624. That Section would give the President or his designee authority: (a) to establish procedures for agency compliance with the bill's requirements for a regulatory analysis for major rules, and (b) to monitor, review, and ensure agency implementation of those procedures.

The Commission supports the purposes and objectives of the bill's requirement for preparation of a regulatory analysis for major rules subject to the specific comments that follow in this letter. The agency currently has procedures for preparation of a value-impact analysis for rulemaking actions. This analysis is essentially a cost-benefit study designed to help the agency make more informed judgments.

The Commission intends to conduct a study to determine what particular changes, consistent with law, might bring current agency procedures more into line with President Reagan's recently promulgated Executive Order 12291 on this general subject.

We share the Congressional concern, as indicated by S. 1080, that agencies better understand the economic costs imposed by regulatory requirements.

The Commission notes that S. 1080 requires an agency to adopt the most cost-effective alternative unless its statute directs otherwise. While the language of the NRC's organic statutes is not explicit, the Commission has consistently interpreted the intent of Congress to be that considerations of public health and safety are paramount. The Commission does not interpret S. 1080 to reverse this paramount role. If our understanding is in error, we request your clarification.

With regard to the Executive Branch oversight of a Congressionally imposed regulatory analysis requirement, we believe that allowing the President or his designee to interpose themselves directly into the agency's regulatory procedures can only weaken, and perhaps ultimately destroy, the independence that Congress intended for NRC. Cooperation between the Executive Branch officials and independent agencies is to be encouraged; nonetheless, S. 1080 goes beyond simply fostering cooperation. Indeed, it provides the opportunity for direct intervention in, and partial control of, an aspect of agency rulemaking. The framework established by Congress to guarantee that the decisionmaking processes of independent agencies are free from undue influence by the Executive Branch officials and entities, as well as the unique relationship between Congress and the independent agencies, could be eroded by this provision.

In the event your committee considers it necessary to provide for the Executive Branch oversight, we believe you should also consider the following clarifications and additions to the bill. First, the Executive Branch review should generally be confined to the period after the notice of proposed rulemaking is published. Prenotice submission of an independent agency's proposed regulation or corresponding regulatory analysis unnecessarily risks undue Executive Branch influence of the agency's decisionmaking. Second, it should be made clear that the authority of the President or his designee is limited to a determination whether the agency correctly decided that a rule is, or is not, "major" and has followed the procedural requirements imposed in developing its regulatory analysis. The substantive conclusion reached in any cost-benefit analysis should not be a proper subject for the Executive Branch review.

In addition, we are concerned that the bill's grant of authority to the President or his designee to identify rules as major and to amend an independent agency's schedule for the timing of a rule's review would provide the Executive Branch unnecessarily wide latitude in establishing the priorities of the NRC's review process. We urge that such executive authority be eliminated from the bill.

Finally, we would also like to comment on the bill's requirements in section 553(f)(2) relating to the use of information in rulemakings that is otherwise exempt from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). NRC's authority in several areas, including those concerning physical security and safeguards accounting for special nuclear materials, involves the agency in rulemaking actions that necessarily are based on classified, confidential, or proprietary information that would otherwise be exempt from public disclosure under FOIA. To the extent the NRC has been given the reponsibility in areas that necessarily require the agency to consider sensitive information that Congress previously has determined should be exempt from disclosure, e.g., 47 U.S.C. § 2167 (special nuclear material safeguards information exempt from FOIA disclosure), the goal of effective regulation is not served by now requiring even partial disclosure, in the form of a sanitized summary, as S. 1080 would require.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide the Commission's views on S. 1080.

Sincerely,

Nunzio J. Palladino.[1] ●

REPORT ON TRIP TO JAPAN—JANUARY 7 TO 14, 1982

● **Mr. CHAFEE.** Mr. President, earlier this month, Senator DANFORTH and I spent a week in Japan at the invitation of the Japan Institute for Social and Economic Affairs.

While we were in Tokyo, we met with Mr. Shintaro Abe, the Minister of International Trade, Mr. Yoshio Sakurachi, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Mazumi Ezaki, the head of the Special Trade Committee in the Diet to deal with United States-Japanese trade problems.

We also met with top executives of the Japanese automobile manufacturing companies as well as other industrial leaders.

We used each meeting to stress the necessity for the removal of nontariff trade barriers which act as a major hindrance to imports into Japan. United States and other non-Japanese made goods in many instances are effectively barred from Japan, which is the second largest market in the world.

Partially as a result of such nontariff barriers, the United States had a trade deficit with Japan of $10 billion in 1980, more than $16 billion in 1981 and an estimated $20 billion in 1982. At the same time Japan has capturd an extraordinary share of the total U.S. market in some large and important industries, for example: 22 percent of autos, 10 to 15 percent of steel, 20 to 30 percent of televisions, 90 percent of motorcycles, 50 to 60 percent of radios, 30-plus percent of cameras, 50-plus percent of recording equipment, 50-plus percent of watches, 20-plus percent of machine tools.

We noted repeatedly that these levels of encroachment would never be tolerated by the Japanese in their markets, yet they are occurring in the United States while the Japanese keep many of our goods from coming into Japan.

During these discussions, it was pointed out that the American public is very sensitive to increases in imports at a time of high domestic unemployment. This is especially true in the automotive industry, where imports account for 22 percent of the U.S. market and 350,000 auto workers are unemployed.

The Japanese cannot continue to play by two different sets of rules—one for their exports to the United States, and another less favorable set of rules for U.S. imports. The American people will not be mollified by piecemeal trade concessions in such areas as citrus fruit, beef, tennis balls, or baseball bats.

If the Japanese Government, we warned, does not take broad-ranking, concrete steps to open its markets to U.S. products and services, the demand in the United States for import quotas, domestic content requirements, and reciprocity legislation will increase.

As a result of our discussions, I believe the Japanese understand the need for action. The Japanese Government intends to announce soon the steps it proposes to take to remove nontariff barriers. One specific measure which we discussed was the acceleration of the Japanese tariff reductions agreed to during the multilateral trade negotiations. The tariff reductions would be an important step toward encouraging U.S. exports to Japan.

In connection with my home State of Rhode Island, I had several meetings with Government and industry representatives to discuss the possibility of increasing U.S. jewelry and fish exports to Japan. As a result of these meetings, Rhode Island has been invited to send a delegation to participate in a trade fair sponsored by the Manufacturing Imports Producers Organization to be held in Tokyo in late March, which will allow Rhode Island producers to promote jewelry and fish exports.

Regarding fish exports, one problem seems to be that while there is considerable emphasis on pressing agricultural exports by U.S. Government officials and commercial attachés, the same is not true of the export of fish. Perhaps additional manpower and also increased awareness of the export potential in fish, is required.

As for jewelry exports, I am working to insure that the accelerated tariff reductions include jewelry. The extension of the tariff reductions to jewelry should provide an added export incentive, since the high Japanese tariffs currently applied to jewelry imports are a significant trade barrier.

I have also arranged for a Japanese trading company to come to Providence to give a seminar for local businesses interested in exporting to Japan to teach them how to deal with Japanese customs laws, banking procedures, and other potential hurdles. Finally, I have asked the Department of Commerce to sponsor an export promotion conference in mid-March in Providence, R.I., at which small businesses can learn how to export their products.

It was our privilege to tour several Japanese manufacturing plants including Toyota, Nissan, and Sony. Such visits are extremely sobering for anyone who has some modest familiarity with U.S. plants and with U.S. business. The Japanese are capturing such a large share of U.S. and world markets, not because of some secret formula, but because they are doing correctly the very basics which the U.S. industry once observed—hard work, careful planning, attention to their workers, constant stress on quality, investing for the future, and a willingness to plan for the long haul.

It is commonplace to blame our competitive plight on U.S. workers for their failings vis-a-vis their Japanese counterparts. This is too simple and not accurate. Success in industry is based on three factors, each as important as each leg on a three-legged stool—government, labor, and management. In Japan all three of these groups are devoted to the betterment of industry and its products. The result has been an incredible success story.

What can we do to make us more competitive?

On the Federal Government level, I believe in the last year we have made considerable progress toward improving our industrial climate. The accelerated depreciation enacted in the 1981 tax bill will be a big help, as hopefully will be the tax credit for increases in research and development. The relief from U.S. taxation of Americans abroad is widely acclaimed by U.S. business. The changes in the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and the Trading Company Act, both of which have passed the Senate but not the House, are needed if our overseas position is to be strengthened.

As U.S. Government elected officials we have a responsibility to do all we can to create conditions where our companies can compete successfully.

The second leg of the stool is labor or the individual worker. He or she must recognize the need to give one's best effort with constant attention to the quality of the work performed. Consumers all over the world demand products that will last and do not require constant repair—and all at a reasonable cost.

The Japanese worker is a formidable competitor. He is loyal to his company—absenteeism is nearly unheard of—and he gives top performance while on his job. I am confident U.S. workers can match and exceed their Japanese counterparts.

The final leg on the stool is U.S. management—a group that must bear a substantial share of the blame for our declining position.

Our management must relearn a host of basic lessons that enabled us to become the world's industrial leader: Loyalty and concern for one's workers; investing in research and development; hustling for markets; tailoring one's product for the customer and then servicing that customer; always stressing quality; and not constantly worshipping at the shrine of the quarterly statement. Management also could learn to practice a bit of company loyalty and not constantly leap to a higher rung elsewhere.

The attitude of American management simply has to change its focus from short-term profit to long-term success. This short-term profits philosophy has decreased our competitiveness by cutting back on research, innovation, and risk taking, and lessened the concern for quality. The result is that our productivity level has fallen sharply since 1973, the level of research investments has not increased since 1966, and the United States has the lowest rate of investment among

industrialized nations in new productivity-improving machinery compared with our GNP. In this regard, I attach herewith two articles from the Washington Post, which are relevant to this topic.

The first article extensively quotes Reginald Jones, former chairman of General Electric, regarding the need to change the focus of American management. The second concerns the degree to which Japanese productivity and superior management have contributed to the United States-Japanese trade imbalance.

In summary, Mr. President, I believe that we must continue to press the Japanese to open their markets to U.S. goods and services. However, my recent trip to Japan convinces me that if we are to get at the heart of what is causing our trade deficit with Japan, the three major ingredients for industrial success—government, labor and management—had best recognize that each has big improvements to make. Let us proceed to accomplish these improvements immediately.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 24, 1982]

Japan's Nontariff Barriers Only Part of an Epidemic

Once again, the amazing Japanese economy is the envy of the rest of the world. While the United States and Europe are suffering recession and high unemployment, Japan is ending its fiscal year on March 31 with a real growth rate of 4.1 percent, with unemployment a tiny 2.2 percent. And the forecast for fiscal 1982 is for a further real GNP gain of 5.2 percent, with unemployment at 2.1 percent.

Since this great economic success is led by Japan's exports, it is understandable that U.S. Trade Ambassador Bill Brock has been trying desperately to tell the Japanese that the $20 billion trade deficit the United States will incur this year with Japan is "politically unacceptable." At half that number, Brock says, "there has been grumbling."

Brock is trying to get the Japanese to wash away the "nontariff barriers" (NTBs)—some antiquated, some newly devised—they use to keep foreign goods out. For example; American baseball bat manufacturers might reasonably have expected to benefit from the Japanese devotion to the American sport. But by specifying a "safety standard" that only six manufacturers can meet—strangely, all Japanese—Japan has effectively protected the entire baseball bat market.

Japan's baseball bat NTB is just one small but dramatic example of a worldwide epidemic. Japan has all sorts of barriers to limit telecommunications purchases by its national telephone monopoly. Although the United States likes to brag that it has the most open economy in the world (and by and large it does), the United States twisted Japanese arms last year to establish "voluntary" quotas on car and truck imports. France, Canada, Italy, and the U.K. each have a different quota restriction on Japanese cars and on some electronic goods.

Maybe the worst example of bilateral trade discrimination, making a mockery of the idea of equal treatment, is the notorious Multi-Fiber Agreement initiated in 1974 by which all of the rich nations manage a set of restraints against textile imports from poor countries. The United States recently agreed to tighter quotas: If it hadn't acquiesced, protectionist-minded Europe might have slapped even more onerous limits on poor country textile exports—for many, a principal source of their foreign exchange earnings.

The new attention to import problems that create bilateral deficits carries with it, as Washington lawyer Carl J. Green says, "all of the dangers of the 'beggar my neighbor' practices of the 1930s."

But suppose all the Japanese nontariff barriers to imports were chucked overboard. Would that end that country's enormous success? We might get some cosmetic improvement in the trade figures, just as we would if the Japanese boosted their defense expenditures, bought a flock of nuclear reactors, or—as some have suggested—$8 to $10 billion worth of AWACS.

The truth is that after fixing all of the Japanese NTBs, the United States would still face an enormous trade deficit with Japan. As a recent House trade subcommittee report warned, America faces an economic crisis "precipitated by the brilliance of Japan's industrial drive." This bipartisan report said, in effect, that American industry had missed the boat, and that Japan's high-technology industries "will dominate the rest of this century."

If the Japanese are smart, they'll drop their NTBs on baseball bats, tobacco, books, agricultural products—set up to appease special Nipponese interests—and concentrate on the export goods of the '80s, '90s and beyond. Unlike other leading industrial nations, Japan has already been clever enough to yield textiles and other labor-intensive operations while concentrating on the capital-intensive wave of the future.

Brock is sensitive to the dangers of focusing too much on bilateral trade relationships. If we're in the red with Japan, we're in the black with other important trading partners, including Europe, Canada and many of the major developing countries. Moreover, it's the overall "current account," which includes earnings from investments from abroad, that is the real test of a nation's international financial strength. And the United States has been running a worldwide current account balance (although the high-priced dollar is beginning to change that picture.)

But the heat is on to do something about Japan, because those dramatic Japanese trade surplus figures are there—and month by month, year by year, they're getting bigger and bigger: $10 billion in 1980, $19 billion in 1981, something like $20 billion in prospect for 1982 and 1983.

Trade Minister Shintaro Abe, who made a good impression here last week on a get-acquainted mission, told me in an interview that "we feel we should come to grips with the situation by promoting manufactured imports from the United States into Japan." Abe feels that American manufacturers aren't trying hard enough to get into the Japanese market. (He cites figures showing that the European share of imports into Japan is increasing while the U.S. share is declining.) But the Japanese government is pushing through to completion a study of the "alleged NTBs" with a promise of a speeded-up grievance procedure.

"I emphasized to Brock and Secretary [Alexander] Haig that the U.S. should make further efforts to promote exports," he said. Japan, he observed, has six times as many offices as does the United States devoted to national export activities, and has a 13-to-1 advantage in the number of people involved in export promotion.

Abe was also not shy about pointing out something else: part of the huge jump in the Japanese trade surplus with the United States last year must be laid at the door of Reaganomics. What has happened is that high interest rates here, pushing up the U.S. dollar, depressed the Japanese yen—just as it forced a depreciation in European currencies. That added price-attractiveness to the already quality-attractive Japanese goods.

American officials note that domestic policies, not only American monetary policies, have operated to depreciate foreign currencies. In addition, some U.S. officials believe—although no formal charges have been made through the International Monetary Fund—that the Japanese government has manipulated the yen to keep it too cheap. Abe flatly denied this charge, or that the Japanese government is even in "a position to do such a thing."

The danger now facing the world is that the stagnation of the Western economies this year will heighten the demand for further protection, further bilateral fixes. The total disaster in Detroit—which will worsen if management and labor can't agree on wage restraints—is likely to lead to pressure on the Reagan administration to work for tightening the quota limits on Japanese cars.

The world's leading exporting and importing nations are supposed to get together at the end of the year for a ministerial meeting of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), reaffirming liberal trading principles—and trying for the first time to extend them as well to services and investments.

But it seems to me that the GATT meeting will be a sham if, in the interim, all of the pious rhetoric about multilateral and open trade (doubtless including some that will be regurgitated at the Paris Economic Summit in June) is effectively voided by a burgeoning bilateral protectionism.

Playing It Safe, and Losing Out

(By Peter Behr)

One of the most respected business leaders in the United States over the past decade was Reginald H. Jones, who ran General Electric for nine years until his retirement last April.

For years, he spoke for business in Washington as head of its primary lobbying group, the Business Council, but now his words are directed more toward business. His departing message in a series of speeches and interviews contains a stiff criticism of executives for their part in the battering American business has taken in the past decade.

Hundreds of companies are in serious trouble, and many basic industries are in decline because of competition from overseas. Their plight has exposed a basic weakness in the way these companies were run over the past few decades, according to Jones and other business leaders and analysts. The critics say American management has been shortsighted, going for short-term benefits instead of long-term gains.

Too many corporate managers let their companies get "fat and sloppy" in the glow of the business boom during the 1950s and early 1960s, hanging on to old products and manufacturing processes that crumbled before an invasion of foreign competition in the 1970s, Jones says.

There were many reasons for the decline, he adds, such as the world's economic turmoil and tax policies and governmental regulations that seemed to place firms at a disadvantage against foreign competitors. But the leaders of America's business and financial communities must shoulder part of the blame, he says.

"Any businessman looking for alibis for his company's failings has not had any trouble finding them," Jones says. "But that is cold comfort for a company that finds its markets taken over by more imaginative and aggressive competitors.

"The evidence is that our foreign competitors are moving quickly to adopt the new technologies that will dominate the factories and offices of tomorrow," Jones said in a speech shortly before his retirement. And he warned that companies that try to make do with old ways "are in for big trouble in the 1980s."

The driving force throughout most of business in the past two decades was a push for immediate profits, an allegiance to short-term success that too often obscured the necessity of building for the future, these critics say.

The battle plan in much of business during the '60s and '70s was play it safe; take the shortest, surest route to instant profits; avoid risks and sacrifice investments in uncertain technology or unproven new products if they threaten achievement of the goals at hand.

Before he joined the Reagan administration as Commerce Department secretary, Malcolm Baldrige ran Scovill Inc., a Connecticut-based manufacturer of household and automotive products that has had its own battles with foreign competition. "While we were resting on our laurels, companies abroad were taking the long-term risks" and making commitments for the future, Baldrige said. "We were beginning to believe we would never lose. We did not develop new management techniques and got off on this ridiculous kick of trying to increase earnings each quarter.

"We played it safe," Baldrige said.

"Most large companies create a corporate bureaucracy that avoids risks wherever possible," William C. Norris, chairman of Control Data Corp., told a House subcommittee hearing in 1979. "The emphasis today is on immediate payoffs [and] in this environment, development of new products and services takes a back seat," he said. Innovation by small, technology-oriented firms—which traditionally work on the frontiers of change—slowed significantly during this period, he added.

"One of the problems in the United States, with government and business, is the very short-term, expedient approach to problems—this quarter's earnings, this year's budget: 'Get me through the next election or the next board meeting,'" said Bendix Corp. Chairman William Agee in an interview.

"We need a much greater concern for the future," he said.

"The fingers need to be pointed inward," said William J. Abernathy, professor of business administration at the Harvard Business School. "We got complacent, lazy and went to sleep" in the '60s and '70s, he said.

"By their preference for serving existing markets rather than creating new ones and by their devotion to short-term returns and 'management by the numbers,' many [American business managers] have effectively forsworn long-term technological superiority as a competitive weapon," Abernathy and Robert Hayes, a colleague at Harvard Business School, said. That was a fatal mistake at a time when overnight changes in electronics was revolutionizing production processes and consumer products, they said.

"There was more attention given to short-run than longer-term strategies," and that put pressure on company managers to produce profits and sustain them, said William Bowen, head of the management research firm Heidrick and Struggles in Chicago.

This criticism has become widely accepted by the business community. Of nearly 1,000 top executives surveyed this year by Bowen's firm, 76 percent said there has been a damaging overemphasis on immediate financial goals.

THE DAMAGE

There is also general agreement about the damage that this short-term philosophy has done to industrial research and technology, to creativity and innovation, to risk-taking and competitiveness, and to basic industrial processes that determine the quality of the things business makes.

The growth rate of U.S. productivity—a basic measure of the efficiency of manufacturers—has fallen sharply since 1973 and lags far behind levels in Europe and Japan.

Research investments by both government and industry grew rapidly in the '50s and early '60s, but remained essentially unchanged after 1966 when inflation is taken into account.

The nature of industrial research changed as companies moved away from basic research on scientific frontiers toward applied research and development work on immediate problems. A survey of 100 leading firms in 1979 by economist Edwin Mansfield showed that the proportion of company-financed basic research dropped by one-fourth between 1967 and 1977, together with a shift away from relative risk projects.

The United States has dropped to dead last among industrialized nations in the rate of investment in new, productivity-improving machinery, compared with the gross national product.

"There can be little doubt that the creative pulse of the country is slowing down," Burton Malkiel, chairman of Princeton University's economics department, concluded as the 1970s drew to close.

The slowdown has been a key factor in the decline of many basic industries. Autos, steel, textile machinery, electronics, footwear and tire industries all suffered tremendously from a surge of imports since the '60s. Imports take an estimated 2.6 million jobs a year from U.S. producers, according to the congressional Joint Economic Committee.

The list of targets in the sights of foreign competitors continues to grow, among them computers for business and homes, semiconductors, telecommunications equipment, household appliances, jet engines, commercial aircraft, electric motors, lawnmowers, chain saws, industrial robots, air compressors and the barely imaginable products of genetic research.

"The Japanese have in many cases simply taken our products and processed them more efficiently than we," said Agee. "But 80 percent of the electronics patents in the last fives years have been issued to Japanese companies, so they're getting ready [to compete] with products as well as processes. We should be very worried," he added.

THE PRESSURES

The debate is not over the problem, but over its roots. And the issue is whether this short-term drive for profits and the cautious, close-to-the-vest strategies of the past decade were unavoidable.

One who thinks so is Alan Greenspan, chairman of President Ford's Council of Economic Advisers and a member of several corproate boards of directors. When inflation broke loose in the late '60s, triggered by the costs of the Vietnam war, everything changed for American business, said Greenspan. Inflation created a tremendous pressure on corporate executives to concentrate on short-lived investments with quick cash payoffs because that was the best insurance against future surges of unexpected inflation that could ruin the value of long-range investments.

"Who's to blame? Should American managers have behaved as if there was no risk?" Greenspan asked. Some companies did, he added, and went belly-up in the process.

"I agree there has been timidity and a lack of foresight. That reflects on all of us. Foresight is available in relatively small doses. Timidity? It might not have been a bad idea," said Greenspan.

Some other observers, though, contend that these outside pressures coincided with a fundamental shift in the behavior of top management in the United States, a change in the "attitudes, preoccupations and practices of American managers," according to Abernathy and Hayes at the Harvard Business School.

They have become leading prophets of the "American business malaise," contending in articles that basic flaws in the training and performance of American managers are to blame for much of the erosion of the nation's competitive edge. Their July, 1980, article in the Harvard Business Review entitled "Managing Our Way to Economic Decline" has gone through more than 23,000 reprints.

As they see it, the industrial boom that began with the end of World War II created a sudden shortage of experienced managers, and the business schools filled the vacuum. The model for success became the hard-charging business-school whiz who could apply management theory to any situation as he climbed the ladder through a succession of short-term stints in different positions. Abernathy and Hayes call this manager a "pseudo-professional"—who lacked expertise in specific manufacturing or technological skills, but who seemed to have an all-purpose background in management.

These managers reached the top rungs in the '60's, and by mid-decade the economy was feeling the twin shocks of escalating inflation and a surge of import competition from the rebuilt industries of Japan and Europe. The new, uncertain environment that followed seemed to demand the new breed of financial and administrative experts over those with "hands-on" experience in production or technology, Abernathy and Hayes said.

A study by Golightly & Co. in 1980 reported that company chairmen and presidents with financial and legal backgrounds increased 50 percent over the past 25 years, and, according to Hayes and Abernathy, this shift in training created a managerial outlook ill-suited to bold ventures with new products or costly modernization of plants to gain a leg up on competitors.

THE MERGERS

In many large companies, the competitive juices flowed in another direction, giving rise to the free-wheeling acquisition of smaller companies in unrelated businesses, in the hope that losses in one area would be offset by gains in another. Business schools encouraged this approach to risk management and the merger trend helped the rise of executives with legal and financial backgrounds, rather than engineering or research, for example. "Those with financial training found it a lot easier to move along the acquisition route," said Jones.

The merger trend, which has grown virtually unchecked since the end of World War II, also fit in with a common sociological view of postwar Americans—an impatient people on the move, dismissing their roots and eager for instant success.

"Mergers are obviously an exciting game: they tend to produce fairly quick and decisive results, and they offer the kind of public recognition that helps careers along," Abernathy and Hayes said.

Critics of the merger wave say, however, that it has distracted attention of top business leaders from both long-term challenges and the daily struggle for quality. Norris of Control Data concludes that "many forced takeovers originate in managerial ambitions, and few serve the long-run interests of the stockholders of the acquiring company."

In many established industries, mergers became a substitute to long-term commitments to technological progress—the approach that foreign competitors would follow in catching and surpassing U.S. firms, Hayes and Abernathy said. Too many business managers failed to see that sucess in the 1970s and 1980s would depend on the ability to find new products, create new markets and provide superior quality, the two Harvard professors said. "Guided by what they took to be the newest and best principles of management, American managers have increasingly directed their attention elsewhere."

"It is this new managerial gospel," they add, "that has played a major role in undermining the vigor of American industry."

There were many other new pressures on corporate leaders in the past two decades that distracted them from attention to long-range needs—pressures that most managers hadn't been trained to handle, said Jones. "We had to learn to grasp the significance of new social responsibilities," Jones said. Civil rights and equal opportunity hiring, lobbying, public relations and corporate ethics were new, troubling issues for business in that period.

But the greatest error was in ignoring foreign competition in the '50s and '60s, Jones said. The American market was so large and so strong that many managers never looked beyond it. And when that economy got into trouble, companies didn't look hard enough for new business outside the United States.

"We were pretty cocky . . . we assumed that American producers were the best and the others were imitators, and poor ones at that.

"We found out that wasn't true," Jones said. That insight has come too late for some companies challenged by foreign competitors. For most others, he said, it can be the shock that wakes up American business management.●

DEATH ON THE HIGHWAYS TAKES NO HOLIDAY

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, for most of us the holidays are a time of family togetherness, warmth and happiness. Occasionally, however, we are confronted with a brutal reminder that death on our Nation's highways takes no holidays. Such was my reaction upon reading the tragic story of the Proctor family of Montgomery County, Md. Traveling to a Christmas Eve musical pagent at their church, five members of the family—two sons and three grandchildren—were killed in a head-on collision on a rural highway 30 miles west of Baltimore. Two other members of the family were seriously injured. The driver of the car which struck the Proctors head-on has been charged by police with drunk driving.

A similar tragic accident occured Christmas morning in Boston, when four members of a family were wiped out at the hands of a 16-year-old drunk driver in a head-on collision. I am sure there were other similarly tragic family accidents caused by drunk drivers on a holiday weekend that saw 560 persons die on American highways.

The words of Richard Proctor, who lost two sons and three grandchildren in the Montgomery Country tragedy, captures our reaction to a loss of this kind: "I'm not a vindictive person," Proctor told the Washington Post, "I can't believe this sort of thing can continue, and can't believe there aren't ways to do something about this situation."

It is indeed hard to comprehend why our society continues to accept, year after year, over 25,000 deaths at the hands of drunk drivers. A car with an intoxicated driver is precisely as dangerous as a loaded gun in the hands of someone blinded by rage—the combination of an instrument with the power to kill and a person who is past the powers of reason is precisely the same in both cases.

Drunk driving has flourished in the United States primarily because we have tolerated it. Today, there are encouraging signs that at last the American people are waking up and demanding that their legislators do something about this ever-present threat to human life on the highways. Last September, Maine enacted the Nation's toughest drunk driving law, mandating a 48-hour jail sentence, a $350 fine and 90-day license suspension for all persons convicted of criminal drunken driving offenses. More than 300 persons have served jail sentences in the 4 months since the law went into effect, and Maine officials have reported an encouraging drop in drunk driver fatalities. Other States have formed task forces to study ways to strengthening their laws and keeping drunks off the highways. Also encouraging is the report that the Reagan administration has decided to appoint a Presidential commission to attack this problem on a national level.

Any situation accounting for over 25,000 deaths each year is a problem that is truly national in scope, and should be treated as such. I have introduced legislation, S. 671, to encourage all States to enact minimum, mandatory penalties for convicted drunken drivers. This bill is cosponsored by Senators GLENN, GOLDWATER, HUDDLESTON, INOUYE, MATHIAS, SARBANES, and BAUCUS.

I return to the words of Richard Proctor, "I can't believe there aren't ways to do something about this situation." In my view, the single most important way we can combat drunk drivers is with a national minimum standard of punishment, just as we have the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit and other national safety standards. Drunk driving is the No. 1 highway safety problem in this country, and should be attacked through national standards to create a uniform expectation of punishment in each of the 50 States.

Mr. President, I ask that the Washington Post story entitled "Family's Trip to Christmas Eve Service Ends in Tragedy," which appeared on December 26, 1981, be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

FAMILY'S TRIP TO CHRISTMAS EVE SERVICE ENDS IN TRAGEDY

(By Michael Isikoff)

The holidays were going to be something special this year for the Proctors, a tightly knit religious family in upper Montgomery County. Richard and Martha Proctor's oldest daughter had just given birth to her third child. One son had traveled from Texas for what was to be the family's first Christmas together in years.

Instead, five members of the family—two sons and three grandchildren—were killed Thursday afternoon in a head-on collision on a rural highway in Carroll County about 30 miles west of Baltimore. They had been on their way to a Christmas Eve musical pageant at their church.

Those killed were Terry Proctor, 22; Roger Proctor, 14, and three small children, Rebecca Jeanette, 3 years, Pauline Jeanette, 18 months and Ruth Ann Jeanette, one month. The children were the daughters of Tanya Jeanette, 21, the Proctor's oldest daughter, who was injured in the crash.

Maryland state police said the accident occurred near Mount Airy, when a Plymouth station wagon swerved across the center of Rte. 27 and collided with the Proctors' Volkswagen Rabbit.

Two others in the Proctors' car, including Martha Proctor, 45, and her younger daughter Shelia, 17, were injured in the 3:55 p.m. crash. Richard Proctor, a physician, was at his job in Bethesda where he recently became commandant of students at the Naval Medical Center.

Police, who are still investigating the incident, have charged the driver of the other car, Kevin Cooper, a 25-year-old Glen Burnie construction worker, with driving while intoxicated, reckless driving and failure to keep to the right of the center line. Cooper was admitted to Carroll County General Hospital and treated for a possible dislocated hip.

"He said he probably fell asleep," Maryland State policeman Dennis Murphey said Cooper told police. "He doesn't remember."

"I'm not a vindictive person," Proctor said in a telephone interview yesterday afternoon. "But I also come from a family that doesn't drink. I can't believe this sort of thing can continue, and can't believe there aren't ways to do something about this situation."

"I'm not bitter," he added. "Bitterness isn't going to bring back my children and grandchildren."

The Christmas Eve pageant at the church was to be a family event for the Proctors. The newborn baby would play Jesus, and Tanya was to be Mary. The family had persuaded Terry to play Joseph.

As word of the accident spread yesterday throughout the Proctors' quiet residential neighborhood in Clarksburg near the Howard County line, friends and neighbors reacted to the news with varying stages of disbelief.

"I can't think of anybody less deserving for this to happen to," said Mavis Bauer, who lived next door to the Proctors. "They were an absolutely fantastic family, very close and sharing. I can't comprehend that this has happened."

Bauer and other neighbors described the Proctors yesterday as a friendly and outgoing couple whose life revolved around their children, their grandchildren and their church, United Methodist Church of Westminster, Md.

The couple and two of their teenage children had moved to Clarksburg from Stuttgart, Germany only last June after Proctor, who was an army physician, was appointed to the post at the Naval Medical Center.

A few weeks later, their recently divorced and pregnant 21-year-old daughter Tanya Jeanette, also moved into the home, along with her two babies.

The family quickly became a part of their new community, the neighbors said. Son Roger, 14, who also died in the crash, was a ninth grader and avid trumpet player who had been practicing hard to make the Damascus High School Band.

The 17-year-old daughter, Shelia, was involved in school drama. Martha, the mother, was the director of religion at the church. "She was very interested in the church," said James Snyder, who lived across the street from the Proctors. "She felt it was her duty."

Tanya's daughter was born on the Friday before Thanksgiving, and the event brought both joy and sadness to the Proctors, according to Mavis Bauer.

When complimented on how adorable her babies were, Tanya replied, "I know. I just wish I had somebody to share them with," recalled Bauer. "I think she had decided she was really going to concentrate her life on those babies."●

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL IS FRAUGHT WITH MISCHIEF

● **Mr. EAST.** Mr. President, Peter Brimelow, a talented young writer for Barron's, has writen a thought-provoking commentary on the Voting Rights Act extension bill which this body will soon consider.

Our job is to calmly consider the merits of each piece of legislation, free from emotionalism, keeping in mind that bad legislation can have a high-sounding name.

I am still studying this bill and possible amendments, and the effect they might have on citizens of all races. I commend Mr. Brimelow's article to my colleagues. I ask that his article in the January 25, 1982, issue of Barron's be published in the Record.

The article follows:

Uncivil Act: The Voting Rights Bill Is Fraught With Mischief

Sitting on the edge of his seat, obediently bobbing up and down at the behest of a roomful of electronic journalists and their moody microphones, the bulbous Sen. Charles Mathias of Maryland looked a little like the Goodyear blimp tugging at its mooring mast on a windy day. He was in odd company for a Republican on Jan. 20, the anniversary of Ronald Reagan's first inaugural address, which, in answer to a question, he refused to say was a cause for celebration. But he shared the same prim look of righteous indignation as Senator Kennedy and an assortment of professional liberals sitting at his side, including the NAACP's Benjamin Hooks, whose melodious imputation of racism to a Republican President, Attorney General and/or fellow Senator went equally unchallenged.

The occasion: a press conference called to denounce the postponement for one week of hearings on S. 1992, the Voting Rights Act Extension bill, of which Mathias is the leading Republican sponsor. The total delay thus inflicted on the measure's legislative timetable: nil.

Supporters of S. 1992 become hysterical at the slightest hint of prolonged debate for a simple reason. It is the same reason as causes them, when prodded, to try to intimidate questioners by evoking the heroic age of civil rights in the 1960s, citing a myriad of establishment supporters, pointing to the lopsided House approval of the identical measure during a lull in the economic wars of 1980, and brandishing the list of 60 Senators co-sponsoring Mathias' bill (some of whom have had second thoughts).

S. 1992 cannot bear scrutiny because it is not merely an extension, but an expansion, of the original 1965 Act. It would profoundly affect not only former Jim Crow areas, but also the entire country. Although Hooks testified in House hearings last year that all he wanted was to prevent the semi-automatic release from Justice Department's oversight that was established in the 1965 Act for communities managing 17 years without discriminatory voting practices, it is now clear that civil-rights politicians have seized another opportunity to carve out racial prerequisites, just as the 1964 Civil Rights Act's anti-discrimination provisions have been perverted into a requirement for minority quotas. This is a dagger pointed at the heart of America. Congress' response has been a sordid compound of fatuousness, fear and lack of moral fiber.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act was a brutal measure that should never have been necessary in a free society. The theory behind it was that the denial of access to the polls in certain Southern states was so endemic and vicious as to be irremediable by piecemeal litigation. It required the presumption of guilt, and direct federal intervention. In its aim of increasing black voter registration, the act was immediately and triumphantly successful. But its methods were necessarily crude. For example, it affected all areas with voter turnouts below 50 percent which is how impeccably non-discriminatory communities in New York State come to be included. And this presaged a change of focus, as judges and bureaucrats ceased to concern themselves with the fact of discrimination and entered the more debatable area of its alleged results.

Communities "covered" by the VRA could alter their structure of government only if the Justice Department decided that the effect would not be to discriminate against minorities, who now had the vote. Thus, in 1980, Rome, Ga., was prevented by the Supreme Court from making what was acknowledged to be an innocent change on the grounds that it would coincidentally make it more difficult to elect blacks.

But simultaneously, the Court refused to strike down a similar structure in Mobile, Ala. Because the Mobile structure pre-dated black enfranchisement, and did not reflect a post-1965 change, it could be challenged only on the Constitutional gounds of the 15th Amendment's ban on denial or abridgement of the franchise on the grounds of race. And the Supreme Court ruled that merely because blacks were not elected to the Mobile city commission in proportion to their population share—the "effect"—did not mean its electoral structure was discriminatory. If the law was neutral on its face, the Court said, to overthrow it would require proof of discriminatory "intent."

Supporters of S. 1992 dislike the Supreme Court's view of the Constitution, so they plan to reverse it by statutory means—with fine irony, by the way, since most claim that Senator Jesse Helms' similar strategy with respect to abortion is unconstitutional. Section 2 of S. 1992 would allow a suit to be brought anywhere in the country to suppress all political arrangements that have the "effect" of discrimination. The essential "effect" test: does the arrangement produce minority representation in proportion to minority numbers in the population at large?

Opponents argue that this will inexorably create a system or proportional representation. But minority representation will be not only proportional but guaranteed, as in the Parliament of Rhodesia/Zimbabwe, at the expense of the majority. This was made clear in *United Jewish Organizations* vs. *Carey*. The Justice Department would not believe that a proposed district in Brooklyn with a 61 percent nonwhite majority would elect a nonwhite Representative, because nonwhites were expected to have a lower propensity to vote. Redrawing the boundaries entailed dividing a community of Hasidic Jews, who sued to retain "their" seat: Not being black, American Indian, Asian, Alaskan or Hispanic, but merely white, they were not explicitly protected under the Voting Rights Act. So they lost. The new district, however, preferred the Founding Fathers' theory of representation to that of the Justice Department. It elected Frederick W. Richmond, who, is indisputably white.

The political consequences of S. 1992 could be devastating. At minimum, it will remove from the Republicans one of the traditional fruits of American electoral office: robust redistricting—"gerrymandering," after all, is an American invention. Unfortunately for the Republicans, this will now incur the wrath of Justice Department bureaucrats, if the diluted Democrats turn out to be minorities, as they tend to be. Weakening whites, however, is still okay.

More significantly, S. 1992 is one in a series of steps in the last few years tending to exacerbate and institutionalize racial division. Under the system it proposes, it is advantageous and perhaps necessary for every American to cleave to some organized faction—just the eventuality the Constitution sought to prevent. To make matters worse, legislators elected by homogeneous constituencies would have less and less aptitude or taste for compromise. Politics would degenerate into a rerun of West Side Story.

The truth is that what was once a civil-rights movement has increasingly become a drive for civil privileges. To choose an "effects" rather than an "intent" test, in affirmative action, fair housing or voting rights, is to invest the state on its behalf with the right of endless and infinite social engineering.

Supporters of S. 1992 argue that the intent standard is difficult to prove. Senate opponents plan to produce Irving Younger, one of the country's leading trial lawyers to argue that it is not. Intent is routinely proved in civil and criminal cases without the confession/"smoking gun"-type evidence that discrimination cases are sometimes said to require. In any case, since when was the law supposed to make things easier for the prosecution at the expense of justice?

Those who support S. 1992 know that the proportional-representation argument is a threat to them. Mathias completely evaded the issue in his Dec. 16 speech introducing the bill, presenting Section 2 merely as a technicality made necessary by the Supreme Court's failure to be "clear," i.e. agree with him. Cornered at the press conference, he fell back on the bill's concession that disproportionate representation will not "in and of itself" be evidence of discrimination.

This is just not good enough. The *Weber* decision showed that judges will literally invert the meaning of a statute under the pressure of racial dogma. The vague additional evidence required in S. 1992—a pattern of bloc voting, for example, which could be posited anywhere—will be no problem.

Already some civil-rights politicians, notably Jesse Jackson last fall in Columbia, S.C., frankly asserted that proportionality is their goal.

Senator Mathias will be 60 this year. He has devoted his long career to the liberal cause within Republican ranks, and has met with utter failure. He is not now likely to change his perception of his civil-rights allies, or give up the comforting if illusory sensation of being part of a heavenly (and conquering) host. His own racially divided state will be so hard-hit by litigation if S. 1992 passes that it will practically forfeit self-government. Arguably no great loss. But Mathias, like most elected federal officials, might well calculate that he at least should be able to avoid trouble. Anyway, his seat isn't up until 1986.

And there is an uglier side to the voting-rights debate. It emerges in testimony prepared by NAACP's Hooks for the Jan. 20 hearings. The intents test, it reads, "is oftimes a code word for allowing discrimination to continue, even when the discrimination is there for everyone to see." At the press conference, he left a sly vagueness about his charge of racism as a result of the hearing's postponement: "There has to be a racist around somewhere."

No accusation of witchcraft in Salem ever had the impact that the accusation of racism has on America's current lawmakers.

Others, too: according to opponents of the bill, the leading academic expert on voting rights, Harvard's Abigail M. Thernstrom, has been dissuaded from testifying against S. 1992 by civil-rights politicans' threats to withhold co-operation on her forthcoming book.

The Voting Rights Act Extension Bill is unedifying whichever way you look at it. The "bail-out" provisions are so onerous that there is virtually no possibility any Southern area can independently qualify to escape this second Reconstruction. The bill's coverage of Hispanics, sweepingly defined, materially promotes the emergence of a second Quebec. Times have changed since 1965, and the best solution probably would have been to let the act run its course, prosecuting any subsequent offenders in the usual way. But above all, the daggerpoint must be broken. The effects test must be defeated.●

CLEAN AIR AMENDMENTS

● Mr. **BAUCUS**. Mr. President, the introduction of H.R. 5252, euphemistically referred to as the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1982, has been greeted with loud hosannas from every corner of the administration.

The President in his state of the Union address noted his encouragement at the introduction of this "bipartisan initiative." The Vice President has picked up the H.R. 5252 banner as part of his push for regulatory reform. Even the Assistant Administrator for Air of EPA, the Agency charged by law with environmental protection, has said she is "delighted" with the introduction of the bill.

I for one am not delighted with this bill. I am discouraged.

A brief review of this measure will demonstrate why many members of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee view this bill and the administration's endorsement with dismay. Under the distinguished leadership of Chairman Stafford, our committee has been working diligently toward the formulation of reasonable, responsible amendments to the Clear Air Act.

Amendments of this nature are needed and they deserve prompt action. However, if the administration and some of our colleagues in the House continue to push an agenda such as that embodied in H.R. 5252, I fear the process will be inexorably delayed.

Quite simply, H.R. 5252 would streamline clean air right out of existence. Here are just a few examples.

The bill would double mobile source emission standards for carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen from the current provisions of the Clean Air Act. At the same time, the warranty period for emission control equipment would be reduced from 5 years and 50,000 miles to 2 years and 24,000 miles.

H.R. 5252 would strip the prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) program of its class II and III protection of clean air. In addition, national parks and wilderness areas would be subject to increased air pollution. The bill would also remove the "best" requirement from the "best available control technology" (BACT) standards for new stationary sources.

The measure also would ignore improvements to the act that, in my view, must be considered. Control of toxic air pollutants and emissions which lead to acid rain is conspicuously absent from this proposal.

The list goes on, and I urge my colleagues to scrutinize this proposal. As part of that process, I believe an editorial that appeared January 24, 1982 in the Los Angeles Times entitled "Cleaning Up an Act" merits attention. I ask that it be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

Thank you.

The editorial follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 24, 1982]

CLEANING UP AN ACT

When it comes to air quality, Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Mich.) plays dirty. That may seem a harsh judgment, but no more harsh than a bill that he is sponsoring to roll back automobile smog standards and to strip California of its right to enforce tougher air-quality standards than other states.

Dingell is chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, with jurisdiction over the Clean Air Act, which must be revised or extended this year.

He also represents Detroit, where the auto industry has fought against pollution controls for two decades and is fighting even harder now that the recession and foreign competition have plunged it into a depression.

Dingell has promoted weaker pollution laws behind the scenes for months, getting nowhere. He keeps running up against Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Los Angeles), who chairs the health and environment subcommittee for Dingell and refuses to consider weakening the clean-air law.

Now Dingell has gone public with a bill that, among other things, would double the legal limit for releasing nitrogen oxides through a tailpipe, weaken warranty protections for owners whose control devices fail, and relax efficiency tests for new controls on power plants and factories.

According to reports from Washington, Dingell also has let it be known that he is prepared to play rough from now on, either snatching clean-air legislation out of Waxman's subcommittee or bouncing Waxman out of his job if he refuses to cooperate.

What is at stake here for Dingell's district is about $80 worth of pollution-control equipment that Detroit could leave out of every car if the standards were less strict. Estimates of potential savings run as high as $300, but those assume that Detroit would stop installing small computers under the hood that monitor engine performance and increase fuel efficiency. Given the increased competition for higher mileage, it is not likely that the industry would abandon the computerized control devices.

What is at stake for Waxman's district—and every other part of the country where the air is already dirtier than the law allows—is a significant increase in nitrogen dioxide, one of the basic ingredients of photochemical smog.

Considering that the saving represents less than 1 percent of the cost of the average new car these days, that is not a fair trade.

Dingell and his co-sponsors call their bill a "compromise" effort, largely because it is less noisome than some earlier proposals he was promoting.

He also has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which calls his bill nothing more than an effort to "simplify and clarify" the Clean Air Act. There is some interesting history behind the choice of words.

Some months ago, Louis Harris sampled public opinion on clean-air laws, and found that 80 percent opposed any weakening of the basic act.

The chamber, unbelieving, commissioned its own poll. The results were much the same.

As Harry W. O'Neill, president of Opinion Research, which did the sampling for the chamber, explained his findings to The Times last month, a congressman will not stir up his voters just by fiddling with the Clean Air Act. In ways, for example, that only simplify and clarify.

But, O'Neill said, if the public believes that a politican is trying to weaken the air-quality law, "then he's in trouble."

The message seems clear enough to us. Keep it clean, Mr. Dingell.●

ROOSEVELT AND REAGAN: LEADERS IN THEIR TIME

● Mr. **HATCH**. Mr. President, today this Nation will commemorate the 100th birthday of one of the great men in American history, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Today we honor him, and yet we all remember him as a man who gave this Nation hope at a time when all seemed lost. Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President of the United States in 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944—four times in all—a record that will never be matched in U.S. history.

He was a hero to the common man and history has verified this fact. Franklin Roosevelt exuded a personal strength that transformed the American public from a weary mass of dejected people to an army of beaming individuals. He gave this country a reason to believe in itself again. That is why we will always remember him.

Many of the programs of the Roosevelt era—the New Deal—were the forerunners of the social programs of today. As the chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, I have had the chance to work with these programs on a personal level. Each member of this committee has been faced with a most difficult task this past year, to decide whether we continue in the same direction Roosevelt pointed us, or to make adjustments. We have all had to ask ourselves at what point would F. D. R. himself take a hard look, check the compass, and chart a different course? For the past year we have all wrestled with this question and undoubtedly we will be faced with it again this year.

Mr. President, as I looked out on America last year I saw many of the same feelings that existed in 1932: That feeling of despair, that our problems had finally engulfed us. Americans were once again looking for a leader. Just as they found him then, they found that leader last year. President Reagan gave us all that ray of hope we so badly needed.

The similarities between these two men are striking. In 1931, while campaigning for the Democratic Party's nomination for the Office of President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt raised his hand and said:

> I pledge you—I pledge myself—to a New Deal for the American people. Let us all here assembled constitute ourselves prophets of a new order of competence and courage. This is more than a political campaign; it is a call to arms.

With this statement he set in motion the machinery that brought him a landslide victory. But more importantly, he pledged to the American people that he would bring the change needed in their lives, that he would have the courage to lead when others would criticize. Just over a year ago I stood on the West Front of the Capitol and listened to Ronald Reagan make his inaugural address. Two parts of that speech stand out in my mind and have helped me recall the pledge made by Roosevelt almost 50 years earlier. President Reagan said:

> We have every right to dream heroic dreams. Those who say that we are in a time when there are no heroes, they just do not know where to look. You can see heroes every day going in and out of factory gates. Others, a handful in number, produced enough food to feed all of us and then the world beyond. You meet heroes across a counter. And they are on both sides of that counter. There are entrepreneurs with faith in themselves and faith in an idea who create jobs, new wealth and opportunity. They are individuals and families whose taxes support the Government and whose voluntary gifts support church, charity, culture, art, and education. Their patriotism is quiet but deep. Their values sustain our national life.

A few moments later in this address he brought this all into focus:

> Well, I believe we, the Americans of today, are ready to do what must be done to insure happiness and liberty for ourselves, our children, and our children's children. And as we renew ourselves here in our own land, we will be seen as having greater strength throughout the world. We will again be the exemplar of freedom and a beacon of hope for those who do not now have freedom.

Mr. President, both of these men have had the courage to lead when so many would only follow. Times change. And as the problems of the present generation are solved, so they will contribute to the problems of the generation to come. Roosevelt had the desire to get things going, and if one program proved unworkable, if Congress would not act, or if the Supreme Court denied authority to move in a particular direction, Roosevelt looked for new solutions, for new ways to solve the problems.

That is what we must do today. That is what our President told us in the Capitol just the night before last. The barriers may be different: Congress actions have contributed to the problems, rather than our refusal to act; but they are barriers just the same. They require new solutions.

Roosevelt instinctively understood that the economic troubles of the 1930's required that politicians remove their cloaks of partisanship and work together. President Reagan has left us with no less a challenge. But President Reagan and this Congress are denied some of the solutions President Roosevelt had at his disposal. We have gone to the well of Federal spending too often in the past, the waters do not run as deep anymore. President Reagan has laid out a plan to give the well time to recharge itself. The alternative, as he has so often told us, is to pray for rain. We cannot look to the heavens for our solutions, we must look to ourselves and the American people. And we must act.

President Roosevelt had no choice but to take strong, decisive action for the country's sake. President Reagan must do the same. President Reagan must, as Roosevelt did, inspire the American public. President Reagan has the desire to get things going; he has shown the ability to recognize when a program proves unworkable and successfully search for new ways to solve problems. President Roosevelt's greatest assets certainly were not the programs with which he pushed America back from the great spiritual depression—and it certainly was as much a depression of the spirit as it was financially. Roosevelt's greatest asset was the ability to inspire the American people to have hope. As we saw here Tuesday night, and as millions of Americans saw in their homes, Ronald Reagan is another who can inspire the hope we need so badly.

In the coming months we will have ample opportunities to clash over the nuts and bolts of the task we have laid before us. But let us not forget that we are disagreeing only about the tools we use to build a new and better structure on the framework we already have, and let us remember that it is the whole structure we agree on—and that structure is what President Reagan called the last, best hope of man on Earth, the United States.

Mr. President, I am sure that Franklin D. Roosevelt is watching us all today. I am equally sure that as he looks down on the Oval Office, his chin pushed jauntily forward, a smile comes over his lips as he realizes that once again the ship of state has a captain at the helm.●

NEW FEDERALISM

● **Mr. QUAYLE.** Mr. President, the major thrust of President Reagan's state of the Union message on Tuesday night was a call for a bold new initiative through a program of new federalism. It is a concept which undoubtedly will be thoroughly debated by the Congress, State and local governments and by others interested in bringing government closer to the people.

Gov. Bruce Babbitt of Arizona in this morning's Washington Post described the proposal as elegant and imaginative. I strongly agree with the Governor.

Governor Babbitt declared that we might have both an increased chance of survival and better streets if the President receives a serious and thoughtful response to his proposal. The President's call for a new federalism deserves that response from the Congress.

The Governor rightly states that we must address three important issues as we explore the details of the President's proposal.

First, we must enter into a national dialog that will define the responsibilities of the State and Federal Governments for the coming decades.

Second, we must convince all Americans that this program is designed to protect and foster our civil rights, not attack them. I believe the President has begun this important work. Civil rights are very real rights, not something to be given lip service. We can no longer assume that the States—their Governors, legislators, and local officials—do not also want equal opportunity for those citizens who elected them.

Third, this plan must address the inequities which have existed between the States. Federal aid to the States has itself been unfairly distributed in recent years. For example, out of every $100 Indiana citizens sent to Washington, only $70 came back in Federal spending in 1979 as compared to $245 for Alaska. The President, by beginning a national dialog on the role of the States, can begin to address this question of inequities.

I commend Governor Babbitt's views on new federalism to my colleagues. His reactions provide bipartisan impact to the proper role of government in the years ahead and I ask that this column be included in the RECORD.

The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1982]

HIS PLAN DESERVES A CHANCE

(By Bruce Babbitt)

The president has once again confounded his adversaries by wading ashore on a new beachhead far behind the battle lines. Faced with another year of trench warfare over federal budget cuts, he now proposes to break the impasse by simply handling some 50 federal programs back to the states.

The president's proposal to restructure American government is both elegant and imaginative. Yet state and local officials are already putting on green eyeshades, picking up yellow pencils and reading computer printouts to reckon their gain or loss in each program category. The president deserves better; at the very least he is entitled to a serious and thoughtful response from Congress and all elected officials.

The president has once again accurately characterized the problem. Since the New Deal, an accretion of more than 500 categorical programs has intruded the federal government into our lives at every level from the very important to the trivial. Congress does a little of everything, but hardly anything well. It ought to be worrying about arms control and defense instead of the potholes in the street. We just might have both an increased chance of survival and better streets.

If the president's new federalism is to become reality, as I believe it should, we ought to be addressing three important issues that the president did not pursue in his State of the Union address.

First, we must develop a national agreement on which programs should be run in Washington and which should be left to state and local government. There is a gathering consensus that matters of historical local concern, such as street, airport construction, waste-water facilities and many education programs can and, indeed, will be adequately addressed at the local level.

The major issue will be the entitlement programs, such as Medicaid, AFDC and food stamps. The nation's governors have long argued that these programs are properly a national responsibility. When the unemployment rate is 16 percent in Michigan but only 5.5 percent in Texas, it is manifestly unfair to ask Michigan residents to shoulder welfare burdens created by national economic policies. The president has foreseen this issue and proposed a disingenuous swap; federalize Medicaid to induce state acceptance of welfare and food stamp responsibilities. That proposal should be rejected; the safety net (the president's phrase) ought to be fashioned as a matter of integrated national policy equally applicable to an elderly citizen or a malnourished child whether he lives in Maine, Mississippi, or Arizona.

Second, the president must convince us that his program is not simply a front for neglecting civil rights and abandoning the hard-won gains of blacks and other minority groups. Many federal assistance programs, notably education, were created to provide equal opportunity for minoirty groups victimized by racial discrimination. The president's waffling on the Voting Rights Act and his permissiveness in allowing tax exemptions for educational institutions that discriminate are not reassuring.

Nonetheless, there may be better ways than scatter-gun grant programs to ensure continued progress in civil rights. For example, intrastate equalization of financial aid between rich and poor school districts might do more to ensure educational quality than a dozen categorical grant programs. In place of federal aid, Congress could devise a simple law requiring all states to provide a basic statewide level of school support, something that more than 20 states have already done.

Third, the president must forthrightly address the issue of inequities among states in per capita taxing power and program need. Although these disparities have been heavily relied upon in Congress in creating new programs, the fact is that the gap between rich states and poor states has narrowed dramatically in recent years. No state or city ought to demand continued-level funding just because it was the lucky recipient of a windfall program in the past. Alaskans, who pay virtually no taxes and receive dividend checks each year, may already be getting too much federal aid; in Mississippi, with the lowest per capita income in the country, there may well be a case for supplemental federal aid.

The president's program is revolutionary in the best American sense of the word. He deserves a chance to succeed. Congress, the governors and state and local officials must put aside the green eyeshades and rise to the occasion.●

CELEBRITIES NIGHT WITH THE UTAH SYMPHONY

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Utah Symphony has become one of the best known and acclaimed symphonies in the western United States. With the completion of the new Symphony Hall in Salt Lake City the Utah Symphony has a permanent home. Over the years the symphony has gathered its support from a wide range of individual patrons, all with a common belief that the arts should be fostered by private donations so that the entire public might enjoy the beauty of the music it produces.

This past fall the Utah Symphony held a unique fundraising dinner to honor those persons who had contributed in some form to the cultural development of the United States. The common denominator to all of the people honored was that they all call Utah home. At this event a press information packet was released and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as an example to other charitable groups throughout the United States as a means to raise funds from the private sector. I would point out that the Utah Symphony understands and supports the need for budget cuts, realizing full well that it places an additional burden upon their own fundraising efforts to make up the difference.

The material follows:

CELEBRITIES NIGHT WITH THE UTAH SYMPHONY

On October 23 the Utah Symphony honored 49 Utahans and former Utahans whose contributions to the arts, science, business, industry, government, education, religion and sports have won national and international recognition. The distinguished honorees, who made their way to Salt Lake City for "Celebrities Night with the Utah Symphony" at their own expense from both coasts and many points in between, all share one common characteristic—each calls Utah home or claims close ties to the state.

The celebrities were guests of honor at a pre-concert formal dinner donated by Salt Lake City's Little America Hotel, at a Utah Symphony benefit concert in Symphony Hall, with pianist Grant Johannesen, Music Director Varujan Kojian and Concertmaster William Preucil as soloists (the soloists donated their services), and at an after-concert buffet and reception hosted by Hotel Utah in conjunction with its anniversary celebration. The star-studded extravaganza proved to be the Utah Symphony's most successful fund-raiser on record, with proceeds approaching $400,000.

This unique concept in fund raising came as a direct response to the Reagan administration's efforts to balance the budget by asking the arts to bear their fair share of cuts in federal appropriations. The Utah Symphony Board applauds and fully supports President Reagan's efforts to fight inflation. (Interestingly, some of President Reagan's foremost advisers and supporters were among the honored celebrities—Dr. Richard Beal, Secretary T. H. Bell, Senators Jake Garn and Orrin Hatch, and Dr. Richard B. Wirthlin.) The Symphony staged the Celebrities Night benefit to demonstrate to music lovers around the country that Utahns will take the President's lead and come to the aid of those worthwhile organizations which, like the Symphony, add important dimensions to our quality of life. Over the years the outstanding support of Utah citizens has resulted in the phenomenal growth of the orchestra. The overwhelming response to Celebrities Night from around the state once again showed their commitment to the arts and their willingness to absorb their share of federal budget cuts.

Utahns and former Utahns who participated as celebrities in this historic event were:

Maurice Abravanel, music director laureate of the Utah Symphony;

Jack Anderson, nationally syndicated columnist;

Ellis L. Armstrong, one of the world's foremost engineering consultants;

Sam D. Battistone, president and co-owner of the Utah Jazz (National Basketball Association);

Richard S. Beal, director of planning and evaluation at the White House;

T. H. Bell, U.S. Secretary of Education;

Ezra Taft Benson, president, Council of the Twelve, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS), and former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture;

Clark Bronson, nationally acclaimed wildlife artist and sculptor;

Billy Casper, one of the top golfers of all time;

Robert L. Chambers, chairman and president, Envirotech Corporation;

William F. Christensen, co-founder and former artistic director, Ballet West;

Maxine Conder, former director, Navy Nurse Corps;

Adrian Dantley, Utah Jazz, leading 1980-81 NBA scorer;

George S. Eccles, chairman, First Security Corporation, and former chairman, International Monetary Conference;

Henry Eyring, world famous chemist;

Avard Fairbanks, award-winning sculptor;

Arnie Ferrin, University of Utah athletic director, former collegiate All-American and pro basketball player;

Herman L. Franks, general manager, Chicago Cubs;

David P. Gardner, president, University of Utah;

Jake Garn, U.S. Senator (Utah);

Anthony Geary, star of "General Hospital";

Orrin G. Hatch, U.S. Senator (Utah);

Grant Johannesen, world renowned pianist;

David M. Kennedy, former U.S. Secretary of the Treasury;

Spencer W. Kimball, president, LDS Church;

Willem J. Kolff, pioneer in the development of artificial organs;

Esther R. Landa, past president, National Council of Jewish Women;

Vernon Law, former pitcher, Pittsburgh Pirates, winner of Cy Young Award;

Arch L. Madsen, president, Bonneville International Corporation;

J. Willard Marriott, founder and chairman, Marriott Corporation;

Scott M. Matheson, Governor of Utah;

Kieth Merrill, Academy Award-winning motion picture director;

Glenn E. Nielson, founder of Husky Oil, chairman of Nielson Enterprises;

Esther E. Peterson, honorary president, National Consumers League, and adviser to three Presidents;

Calvin L. Rampton, former three-term governor of Utah;

George W. Romney, former governor of Michigan and U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

Howard Ruff, author of *How to Prosper During the Coming Bad Years;*

John W. Ryan, president, Indiana University;

Alexander Schreiner, Salt Lake Tabernacle organist for over 50 years;

Brent Scowcroft, Lt. General, U.S. Air Force, prominent military educator and Presidential adviser;

Belle S. Spafford, president of the Relief Society (women's organization, LDS Church) for 29 years, past president of National Council of Women;

N. Eldon Tanner, first counselor, First Presidency, LDS Church, and prominent Canadian industrialist and politician;

Obert C. Tanner, founder and chief executive officer, O. C. Tanner Jewelry, educator, author, lawyer, philanthropist;

Dian Thomas, author of *Roughing It Easy,* star of radio and television;

E. Parry Thomas, chairman, Valley Bank of Nevada, leading financier;

Glenn Walker Wallace, influential in founding of Utah Symphony and Ballet West;

O. Meredith Wilson, past president, Universities of Oregon and Minnesota;

Maxwell M. Wintrobe, world renowned hematologist, past president of American and International Societies of Hematology;

Richard B. Wirthlin, chief strategist, 1980 Reagan Presidential campaign, and president of Decision Making Information.

Numerous individuals and organizations made substantial contributions to the Utah Symphony in connection with the Celebrities Night festivities. A unique way of selling the $100 tickets to the event was packaging them in blocks of 50. The blocks were then offered to businesses for $5000 a block. A purchaser of a block of tickets received as a special bonus the privilege of hosting a table at the pre-concert dinner where one of the celebrities and his or her partner were seated.

Little America contributed the pre-concert banquet for 425 Maestro Club members, celebrities, hosts and other honored guests. Likewise Hotel Utah donated an after-concert buffet-reception attended by most of the 2800 ticket holders. The United Nations Association of Utah, the Salt Lake Chamber Ensemble, Alan Frank & Associates, Edison Street Recording, KSL-TV, Nordstrom, ZCMI, and press and broadcasting organizations throughout the state also contributed to the evening's success through the donation of goods and services.

A 15-member committee chaired by Dr. R. J. Snow, vice president of both the Utah Symphony and the University of Utah, spent some three months planning and coordinating this unique fundraiser under the direction of Symphony President Wendell J. Ashton. Working with Dr. Snow on the Celebrities Night Committee were Arch L. Madsen (ticket chairman), Fred S. Ball, Veronica O. Bettinson, Mrs. Dan S. Bushnell, LolAnne Eyring, Alan F. Frank, Alison A. Gregersen, Herold L. Gregory, Betty L. Kay, Kenneth R. Lord, Ronald L. Rencher, David K. Richards, J. Gary Sheets and Ray L. White.

In the weeks since the benefit occurred, letters and telegrams of thanks and congratulations have been pouring in to Mr. Ashton. Clark Bronson was "impressed with the entire evening—the dinner, the performance of the Symphony, Symphony Hall, and the reception at Hotel Utah afterward." Robert L. Chambers called it "one of the best managed, most creative and pleasant events I ever attended. The superb performance by the orchestra in your magnificent Symphony Hall was the crowning touch." Arnie Ferrin congratulated Mr. Ashton on "an enjoyable evening, done with your usual flair for excellence." "A grand occasion," wrote Esther R. Landa, "done magnificently in every detail." Other comments were: "a wonderful and special evening"—Vernon Law; "extremely well done"—Arch L. Madsen; "an evening long remembered"—Esther Peterson; "an unusually happy experience"—Belle S. Spafford; "one of the most memorable days of my life"—Dian Thomas; "a glorious night . . . a breathtaking combination"—O. Meredith Wilson.●

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I should like to make a change in the schedule. I have consulted with the minority leader. Although I do not see him in the immediate vicinity of his desk, I am prepared to say he is in agreement with this change in schedule.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS TOMORROW UNTIL TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1982, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, earlier it had been announced and I believe there is an order that after the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until Monday next. In view of the colloquy conducted with the minority leader in respect of Senate Resolution 20, the television debate measure, and since we cannot reach that consensus on Monday, it seems better to come in on Tuesday. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Friday, tomorrow, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 o'clock on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR QUAYLE AND SENATOR BENTSEN ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1982

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 2, when the Senate reconvenes, special orders in favor of the following Senators in the following order be entered: The Senator from Indiana (Mr. QUAYLE) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY—PROTOCOL OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON THE ACCESSION OF SPAIN

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Spain, signed in Brussels on December 10, 1981, on behalf of the United States and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty (Treaty Document No. 97-22), transmitted to the Senate on January 26, 1982, by the President of the United States, and ask that the protocol be considered as having been read the first time; that it be referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The message of the President is as follows:)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Spain, signed in Brussels on December 10 1981 on behalf of the United States and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding this matter.

Spain's rededication to the values and purposes underlying the North Atlantic Treaty, and her decision to seek full partnership in the effort to maintain Western security, are historic developments and a source of inspiration in these troubled times. Spain's strategic location, and human and material resources, will make a major contribution to the security of the Alliance. Accordingly, I urge that the

Senate give early and favorable consideration to this protocol.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 26, 1982.*

ORDER FOR JOINT MEETING WITH THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON APRIL 21, 1982

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on April 21, 1982, the Senate join with the House of Representatives to hold a joint meeting for the purpose of hearing an address from Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN TODAY UNTIL 5 P.M. AND AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS RELATED TO FUNDING RESOLUTIONS UNTIL 3 P.M. ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1982

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, rule XXVI, paragraph 9, provides that the annual authorization resolution of any committee shall not be offered later than January 31 of any year, with exceptions that are not pertinent at this time. Inasmuch as January 31 falls on a weekend this year, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, January 29, committees may have until the hour of 3 p.m. in which to file reports related to funding resolutions and that, today, the RECORD may remain open until 5 p.m. for the filing of bills, resolutions, and reports.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMISSION TO BROADCAST IN THE UNITED STATES THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION AGENCY FILM "LET POLAND BE POLAND: A DAY OF SOLIDARITY WITH THE PEOPLE OF POLAND"

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House on House Joint Resolution 382, a joint resolution to provide for the release within the United States of the U.S. International Communication Agency production "A Day of Solidarity," and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> A House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 382) to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be considered as having been read the second time by title. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BAKER. I am informed, Mr. President, that this resolution has been cleared for immediate action by the other side.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the House joint resolution.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations assented by overwhelming voice vote at the committee's business session on Tuesday to this joint resolution providing for release in the United States of the ICA film to be transmitted by satellite to the world of this Saturday's "A Day of Solidarity."

All Americans want to join in this protest at repression in Poland, and this plea that Poland be allowed to return to the free resolution of her own problems through free negotiation among Poles themselves, without the relentless Soviet pressure that inspired the present crackdown.

We cannot in conscience let this opportunity go by to stand up and be counted for the freedom of our Polish brothers and sisters.

Polish authorities and their Soviet advisers still have a choice. They can end the repression. If they do not, they will bear the full consequences.

To the people and nation of Poland, I join with all Americans who want to reach out in solidarity with them in their hour of need.

The House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 382) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE TOMORROW

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before the majority and minority leaders depart, it is my understanding that, quite possibly, tomorrow, we may anticipate final action on the bill introduced by Senator JACKSON, Senator THURMOND, and myself relating to Admiral Rickover, and that those Senators who may desire to be cosponsors have until tomorrow to indicate their desire and likewise to submit their statements.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to that effect.

May I say that I expect tomorrow there will be very little business transacted other than the matter just addressed by the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BAKER. I also say, Mr. President, that there will be no rollcall votes on tomorrow.

MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, is there an order for the further procession of the Senate to the House?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess and proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for a joint meeting with the House in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

At 10:41 a.m., the Senate, preceded by the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Larry E. Smith; the Assistant Secretary of the Senate, Marilyn E. Courtot; and the Vice President, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Thereupon, in accordance with the order previously entered, at 10:41 a.m., the Senate recessed until Friday, January 29, 1982, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28, 1982:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Fred J. Eckert, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Fiji, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kiribati, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Tonga, and Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Tuvalu.

THE JUDICIARY

Robert B. Krupansky, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, vice Paul C. Weick, retired.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

James L. George, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Charles N. Van Doren, resigned.

Norman Terrell, of California, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, vice Thomas D. Davies, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Capt. James C. Irwin, USCG.
Capt. Bobby F. Hollingsworth, USCG.
Capt. Edward Nelson, Jr., USCG.
Capt. Clyde E. Robbins, USCG.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 837, title 10, United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Anderegg, 285-26-4376FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. William A. Anders, 562-54-4048FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Sloan R. Gill, 222-16-7990FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Gregory, 055-22-1828FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Donald M. Jenkins, 202-20-6243FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Donald J. Licker, 557-34-8002FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Vincent P. Luchsinger, Jr., 482-28-1725FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Patrick J. Marckesano, 119-22-7052FV, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. James W. Taylor, 467-48-0139FV, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier general

Col. Donald G. Aten, 153-20-3767FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Howard L. Brainin, 464-34-6743FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Charles R. Cargill, 463-40-6684FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Herman J. Carpenter, 436-42-7305FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. William L. Harper, 253-36-3749FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Leonard W. Hegland, 536-26-7770FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Arthur H. Hutton, 074-24-7424FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Herbert H. Kaiser, Jr., 356-22-7616FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Charles A. Kelly, 335-28-4013FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Marc M. McClelland, 146-26-0053FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. William B. McDaniel, 229-32-1218FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Byron E. Mills, Jr., 265-34-1772FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Robert G. Mortensen, 561-40-0525FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Richard A. Northrup, 029-26-1674FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Charles R. Parrott, 001-20-7691FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Walter L. Saur, 481-24-2279FV, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Roger P. Scheer, 328-24-8077FV, Air Force Reserve.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the U.S. Air Force to the grade of brigadier general, under the provisions of chapter 36, title 10 of the United States Code:

Col. Joseph A. Ahearn, 499-36-7710FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas A. Baker, 551-42-0058FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas P. Ball, Jr., 260-44-4995FR, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Richard S. Beyea, Jr., 465-48-3248FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert C. Beyer, Jr., 056-26-5469FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Anthony J. Burshnick, 193-26-5025FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Henry D. Canterbury, 416-48-0432FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Vernon Chong, 563-44-8468FR, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Donald L. Cromer, 518-34-5921FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. James L. Crouch, 449-50-5201FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alexander K. Davidson, 540-36-0728FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. James B. Davis, 505-38-3274FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lee A. Denson, Jr., 048-26-3226FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Larry D. Dillingham, 484-34-4053FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert D. Eaglet, 287-26-9391FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. George E. Ellis, 005-34-0641FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jack K. Farris, 396-38-0881FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Eugene H. Fischer, 337-24-6756FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Gordon E. Fornell, 331-28-5411FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Wilfred L. Goodson, 442-36-0342FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lee V. Greer, 253-52-0186FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Albert C. Guidotti, 559-42-7650FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ralph E. Havens, 506-42-7223FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald W. Henderson, 229-50-5595FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jerry D. Holmes, 447-30-3500FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Charles A. Horner, 479-40-0449FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Bradley C. Hosmer, 224-48-7119FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Wayne O. Jefferson, Jr., 579-52-8583FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Kenneth R. Johnson, 332-28-0602FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert L. Kirtley, 215-34-2643FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald J. Kutyna, 339-26-1935FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Wayne W. Lambert, 256-54-1653FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas A. LaPlante, 028-28-1265FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Mary A. Marsh, 153-20-3518FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Paul H. Martin, 403-46-7642FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Monte D. Montgomery, 131-26-5276FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Donald L. Moore, 462-52-7633FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Stanton R. Musser, 162-28-1587FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert A. Norman, 007-28-7000FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert W. Norris, 417-44-5019FR, Regular Air Force, Judge Advocate.

Col. Kenneth W. North, 045-24-6561FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard M. Pascoe, 563-40-1916FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard A. Pierson, 013-26-8647FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Albert L. Pruden, Jr., 242-50-7160FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Clifford H. Rees, Jr., 509-38-212[illegible]FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert L. Rutherford, 454-52-7491FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Paul N. Scheidel, 543-38-4087FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. John C. Scheidt, Jr., 127-26-6468FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Alexander M. Sloan, 234-52-5283FR, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Donald C. Smith, 442-34-9390FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Leo W. Smith II, 480-38-3800FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ralph E. Spraker, 519-34-0395FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Samuel H. Swart, Jr., 047-26-8815FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. John H. Voorhees, 152-30-8385FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. Claudius E. Watts III, 245-52-1354FR, Regular Air Force.

Col. David H. Williams, Jr., 466-48-6918FR, Regular Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 601, in grade as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Richard Edward Cavazos, 452-34-5055, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for appointment as Reserve Commissioned Officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a), 3371 and 3384:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Anthony H. Conrad, Jr., 434-34-6453.

Brig. Gen. Robert G. Ownby, 445-34-9105.

Brig. Gen. Manila G. Shaver, 546-34-5276.

To be brigadier general

Col. Randall W. Bell, 124-28-7790.

Col. David M. Burner, Jr., 324-28-9288.

Col. Joseph M. Cannon, 072-24-4062.

Col. Murray E. Cantrall, 312-34-0512.

Col. Keith L. Hargrove, 461-38-2080.

Col. Roy L. Nelson, 435-36-4620.

Col. Elvin J. Schofield, 452-52-6599.

Col. Charles J. Whisnant, 241-52-8988.

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officers named herein for appointment as Reserve Commissioned Officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Glenn H. Kothmann, 714-16-9782.

Brig. Gen. James Q. Simmons III, 191-16-8081.

To be brigadier general

Col. Lawrence P. Flynn, 089-22-4944

Col. Walter H. Grimes, 417-38-3639

Col. Robert J. Irvin, 208-22-9814

Col. William A. Jackson, 416-42-6831

Col. Jerome M. Shinaver, Jr., 565-36-5709

Col. Leah W. Stallings, 259-46-0654

Col. Donald E. Stone, 104-22-2418

Col. Gilbert J. Sullivan, 231-32-4942

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve Commissioned Officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles M. Kiefner, 490-28-7292

Brig. Gen. Robert M. Morgan, 447-30-8580

To be brigadier general

Col. Guillermo H. Barbosa, 580-66-9257

Col. Darden J. Bourne, 425-52-0126

Col. Richard I. Braund, 339-24-3159

Col. Forest W. Brice, 414-42-7072

Col. Lawrence B. Campbell, 518-24-8993

Col. William P. Cody, 069-24-0083

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains of the Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of commodore in the staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Joseph S. Cassells

SUPPLY CORPS

Carl R. Webb, Jr.
John H. Ruehlin
Stuart F. Platt

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

John C. Fraser, Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Richard G. Shaffer

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Lewis E. Angelo

IN THE NAVY

The following-named captains of the line of the Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of commodore, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, Section 624, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Unrestricted line officers

Robert E. Klee
James M. G. Seely
Richard F. Donnelly
Don G. Primeau
Roger O. Simon
Harry K. Fiske
James M. Gleim
Diego E. Hernandez

Daniel J. Wolkensdorfer
John R. Wilson, Jr.
"E" Inman Carmichael
John S. Disher
Frank W. Butterworth III
James F. Dorsey, Jr.
William D. Zirbel
Robert S. Owens
William M. Fogarty
Henry F. Boyle, Jr.
Stewart A. Ring
Burnham C. McCaffree, Jr.
Dudley L. Carlson
Leon A. Edney
Gerald L. Riendeau
David W. Cockfield
Hugh L. Webster
Robert H. Shumaker
Oakley E. Osborn
Richard C. Ustick
Jack N. Darby
David E. Jeremiah
Theodore E. Lewin
Ronald M. Eytchison
Dennis M. Brooks

Engineering duty officers

David P. Donohue
Myron V. Ricketts

Aeronautical engineering duty officers

William J. Finneran
John C. Weaver

Special duty officer (Public Affairs)

Jack A. Garrow

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 36, title 10, United States Code, as amended, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Aarestad, Jack C., 130-32-5163
Andres, Carl J., 315-44-7009
Appeldoorn, Ronald E., 476-46-1661
Barad, Leonard R., 352-22-1274
Beidler, Donald B., 373-38-0817
Couture, Paul P., 015-30-6957
Dettmann, Darryl D., 535-36-5110
DeWitt, Dennis H., 482-50-2916
Harrold, Charles Q., 507-50-3842
Hedrick, Michael C., 389-38-3565
Koutnik, Alfred W., 348-32-4146
Kutz, Paul L., 532-36-5741
Lawless, John E., 355-34-8941
McLees, James K., 238-48-4461
Moretsky, Howard, 190-32-6511
Skweir, Michael J., Jr., 175-26-5985
Smith, Jared H., 497-44-6138
Solberg, Peter E., 360-30-4276
Wongwai, George W., 524-38-4952

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Avilescollado, Alberto, 582-66-5623
Baser, Ali N., 500-44-3815
Bellas, Richard C., 211-32-7850
Bost, Charles R., 453-50-2987
Buttemiller, Robert, 350-32-3375
Chambers, William D., 401-40-3549
Claflin, Dale G., 440-40-7914
Dattilo, Frank S., 496-34-4909
Fielding, John D., Jr., 405-46-5682
Foshee, William S., 418-52-9620
Francisco, Edgardo C., 335-32-7251
Hardison, Cary D., 408-62-8515
Harford, Francis J., Jr., 056-32-4514
Hauth, John C., 422-56-9012
Henrikson, Ronald A., 151-30-8443
Honaker, Richard E., 443-30-2215
Humbert, Paul V., Jr., 357-30-3020
Jenkins, Douglas W., Jr., 363-42-8164
Jones, Al E., 257-62-8907
Kendall, Wayne F., Jr., 430-64-8705
Kennedy, Russell V., 028-18-1354
Kindley, Robert T., 243-52-4609
Lentz, Gary D., 574-12-8404
Maffet, Charles K., 400-56-6977
Martin, Harvey C., 513-38-9475
Mataban, Antonic A. B., 071-40-8008
Nepomuceno, Normando R., 134-38-1823
Olson, James E., 520-44-4611
Osteen, Frank B., 247-66-4360
Payen, Hermilando P., 048-46-7442
Rainess, Alan E., 103-28-2493
Reid, Michael J., 530-26-5168
Smith, Hugh N., 415-66-4763
Sorrells, Timothy L., 435-68-1079
Thomas, Robert F., 035-28-1117
Ulrich, Richard A., 160-34-0719
Viscardi, Andrew C., 453-50-9144
Vizcarrondo, Felipe E., 191-38-0428
Wolborsky, Martin, 064-26-3842

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Achterberg, Robert J., 484-62-5624
Bennett, Marvin R., 570-82-6984
Bowman, Larry R., 527-68-9230
Buhrow, Bruce A., 093-38-3502
Collins, David C., 155-34-4631
Crout, Danny K., 249-78-6285
Cyr, John L., Jr., 007-42-4579
Ebright, Craig S., 508-54-3989
Edwards, Paul A., 206-34-3006
Gallagher, Steven J., 505-62-3253
Hablitzel, Matthew L., 279-44-4622
Hartsfield, Charles E., Jr., 429-82-0701
Herber, Hobert E., 531-42-9370
Howell, Richard E., 288-42-9104
Jacobs, Thomas L., 250-86-7408
Jennings, Robert G., 159-38-0701
Labbous, Salem E., Jr., 423-56-8406
Lee, David A., 411-76-7062
Lipsinic, Francis E., 232-74-5195
Mendoza, Mario M., 447-46-9374
Nelson, Curtis O., 314-48-9234
Neilsen, Christen J., 145-36-6272
Occhialino, Richard D., 058-38-3241
Parmann, Donald F., 560-58-5000
Perkin, Robert F., 445-48-4489
Piccinino, Michael V., 069-40-7705
Seaman, Frank E., 547-68-1295
Smith, Alan A., 587-16-7083
Sorum, Larry N., 542-50-9440
Stein, Lester D., 134-38-7014
Trebilcock, Charles E., Jr., 271-40-7396
Valko, Robert M., 522-48-1187
Vogel, James J., 341-38-1298
Waldrop, Thomas C., 582-92-2311
Wisdom, Sidney C., 531-44-6875
Zion, Harvey S., 255-76-6521

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenent colonel

Agresti, Francis L., 202-26-6892
Andrada, Adolfo A., 245-82-5958
Angstadt, Terry L., 564-72-3457
Arnett, Marion L., Jr., 249-80-0484
Aubrey, Howard L., 292-30-0606
Bandolon, Pura K., 353-46-8416
Bradley, Winston E., Jr., 417-64-0526
Brandon, Gary K., 521-50-6873
Burch, John E., Jr., 267-68-3909
Cadiz, Leticia M., 213-68-3371
Castro, Carlos A., 129-48-6530
Cohen, Daniel L., 219-44-5277
Congdon, David R., 008-26-2127
Coscia, John L., Jr., 409-80-7218
Covani, Ricardo N., 360-50-6785
Crow, Ronald M., 448-48-4056
Davis, Richard F., 467-82-5136
Degrano, Araceli C., 112-40-6228
Deorio, James K., 375-50-6026
Depra, Rogelio Doromal, 128-40-5582
Dever, Robert L., 497-50-0861
Duque, Salvador T., 205-40-7323
Dyer, Brien W., 023-34-8414
Fabian, George T., 250-80-4219
Fermin, Romeo C., 572-92-2906
Gillespie, Ritchie P., 224-66-3497
Golle, Rogelio F., 399-56-3207
Gomez, Santos T., 097-44-4924
Gomeztellez, Atilano I., 454-80-1458
Gormley, William T., 522-58-2564
Gray, Mark B., 306-56-5398
Hahn, David Y., 100-42-1963
Haller, Carl A., 145-30-2666
Hardy, Marion J., 043-32-6625
Herbert, Timothy G., 564-72-8659
Herrera, Moses, 465-70-2017
Hong, Young M., 334-54-8077
Iturzaeta, Nenita F., 073-38-5413
Jones, James C., 247-72-9905
Kershaw, Charles H., III, 036-24-9608
Kupko, John J., II, 221-34-2772
Laipple, Douglas K., 185-34-9497
Liang, Chang Y., 281-58-6934
Lifshutz, David M., 453-80-7160
Lim, Leoniso C., 108-48-2382
Lockett, John S., 265-90-6885
Love, Tommy L., 315-50-4797
Manuel, Emanuele L., 160-44-3343
Marsh, Byron P., 243-78-3224
Mauad, Amabie, 051-44-8808
McCracken, John W., Jr., 511-30-4289
McDonald, Edward C., 378-52-8318
McKiernan, Thomas L., 354-42-5357
Means, Robert T., 456-34-0882
Mendoza, Gliceria M., 193-44-7660
Minnick, Larry C., 442-48-6986
Mitchell, Spencer G., 411-66-4005
Naranja, Rogelio D., 032-38-7542
Nicholson, William D., III, 463-70-2176
Olivencia, Font Luis C., 583-10-7132
Parsons, David S., 448-44-8418
Pathak, Nirmal E., 015-52-9417
Patterson, George W., 424-62-7776
Poppell, Samuel E., 263-90-0768
Powell, Stephen T., 507-52-6073
Rashid, Edward R., 171-38-3851
Reddy, Ramasahayam A., 123-48-1560
Rejai, Michael A., 146-46-3890
Reyes, Eulalia P., 578-58-9210
Riddle, Forrest A., Jr., 274-42-9463
Roberts, William E., 419-66-0341
Roller, Jeffrey, I, 102-38-5978
Saettone, Eduardo C., 581-34-4360
Scriggins, Alan L., 213-38-1509
Shaffer, Paul J., 397-32-1876
Shelton, David K., Jr., 249-84-1659
Sonoda, Takuo, 203-44-4307
Stratton, Robert F., Jr., 162-38-9387
Theodore, Guy D., 068-48-9297
Vanhal, Marvin E., 485-50-6911
Ward, Robert C., 261-64-2567
Weiland, Frederick L., 274-42-4303
Williams, Robert L., Jr., 487-46-2476
Yurkosky, Theodore P., 141-36-7598
Zaveruha, Paul A., 042-36-7531

DENTAL CORPS

To be major

Abel, John R., 265-92-5042
Anderson Larry D., 550-76-8628
Bader, Barrett W., 526-04-8223
Bandoni, Lawrence W., 033-38-5119
Barringer, Peter S., 157-46-4409
Basden, James W., 450-88-6833
Beasley, Michael W., 237-88-8903
Beaumont, Robert H., 153-40-2066
Beck, Brian W., 422-64-0950
Bowman, Tommy E., 416-56-0561
Branting, William S., 029-36-7240
Burrows, Charles A., Jr., 130-38-5811
Butasek, Joseph J., 211-32-8777
Canaan, Richard L., 306-50-6135
Carson, John T., 219-60-5438
Cecere, Joseph C., 033-36-1893
Chamberlain, Lyle B., 529-60-6679
Chance, David A., 567-84-6441
Chidley, Craig H., 296-50-7229
Clark, Starr W., 387-48-0564
Cohen, Louis, 064-42-3491
Cohen, Terrell, 571-72-3322
Collins, Neil A., 400-76-2361
Cottrell, Stephen M., 118-38-3030
Crane, Gerald R., 563-74-4910
Davenport, William L., 227-78-8837
Davis, Samuel P., 160-44-8360
Dazey, Steven E., 541-56-0252
Deeley, William S., 276-50-0180
Dent, Michael E., 507-64-5827
Dilorenzo, Scott C., 531-52-7218
Dixon, Dennis C., 521-64-4151
Dunbar, James M., 214-56-4917
Ellis, James R., 550-64-5442
Falsey, David W., 356-50-7002
Felt, McLane H., 528-62-2281
Forsythe, Steven A., 295-46-0099

Foster, Carl D., 465-82-1699
Gaines, George W., 437-84-3789
Gant, Raymond C., 264-66-5656
Gibson, Donald P., 306-54-1851
Girvan, Thomas B., 544-56-5643
Gordon, Wendell T., 463-98-7650
Graham, Benjamin P., 084-40-0858
Harvey, Joseph M., 505-74-0396
Hebertson, Scott, 506-70-8248
Henderson, Charles W., 509-48-5281
Hu, Vincent C. H., 291-54-2178
Jacobs, Michael S., 453-88-4219
Johnson, Robert S., 007-50-4045
King, Christopher L., 408-94-1127
King, Thomas N., 314-46-4698
Koeppen, Raymond G., 145-46-8342
Kois, John C., 129-42-4385
Kretzschmar, Samuel, L, Jr., 458-82-5744
Larsen, Robert B., 502-58-5738
Leonardson, Gregg A., 398-50-3662
Lillard, Timothy L., 458-78-5523
Luethke, Larry D., 449-86-4479
May, David L., 494-50-2110
McGuff, Howard S., 457-90-1246
McHenry, Michael A., 558-92-5980
Messersmith, Marion L., 505-68-3325
Miller, Brock C., 391-54-1508
Mills, Shannon E., 562-68-1597
Montgomery, Carlton L., 498-56-7056
Morad, Branden G., 109-38-2552
Nelson, Charles L., 307-50-1148
Newland, Timothy B., 482-54-9177
Orr, Richard K., 237-88-9355
Palmer, David S., 005-44-5538
Paolillo, Robert C., 496-52-0742
Parrish, Lawrence C., 561-84-6663
Pinkerton, Kenneth C., 155-40-5696
Reagan, Stephen E., 445-44-5124
Roberts, Frank T., Jr.., 244-76-4540
Roberts Michael J., Jr., 132-40-6889
Ryles, Robert L., 255-76-4214
Sallustio, Frank W., 050-42-8872
Schwartz, Richard S., 472-60-7006
Seifert, John H.., 542-64-8385
Smith, Keith S., II., 233-74-0890
Sokolowsky, Melvin J., 535-52-8195
Solberg, Ronald E., 469-52-2277
Spielberger, Michael C., 343-40-8168
Starr, Clifford B., 015-42-6571
Stewart, Charles D., 464-84-6126
Strauss, Steven A., 119-38-9239
Suber, Leitzsey Y., 249-82-0539
Sudholt, Alex E., 496-60-4756
Thompson, William E., 488-58-2394
Torresvazquez, Manuel., 580-84-1791
Vitale, John W., 158-42-9108
Wade, Byron M.., 398-56-6098
Walker, Michael J., 533-50-8071
Warren, Laurence A., 205-36-8482
Weichel, Erwin, 544-50-1294
Wendt, Stanley, L., Jr., 460-84-7020
White, John C., 299-50-0014
Wilson, Steven R., 313-58-2245
Wood, Leighton W., 410-92-5205
Zurasky, John E., 170-42-5929

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

Abdel, Aziz Mohamed I., 100-58-6636
Abernathie, Dennis L., 496-54-0138
Abraham, Robert E., 430-92-1978
Acker, William R., 080-38-0358
Adams, Jay S., 373-56-0110
Adams, Richard N., Jr., 060-42-1454
Alford, Anthony L., 455-72-6912
Allen, William M., 462-90-3672
Amendt, Wayne C., 562-92-8864
Amisial, Pierre A., 577-72-3385
Andersen, David A., 504-60-3182
Anderson, Neal K., 021-44-5127
Armstrong, Craig W., 529-62-8077
Arnold, Roy M., 511-50-9273
Arroyo, Luis C., 583-42-5214
Atkins, Thomas N., 508-62-2312
Bailey, Thomas D., 067-44-8033
Barnard, Mark L., 422-72-6733
Barnhill, James E., III, 416-72-4061
Barr, Stephen J., 498-52-9549
Barsotti, Richard J., 542-52-9562
Bassett, David W., 217-44-4983
Batipps, Gerald P., 179-40-1636
Beall, Sandra C., 587-26-5936
Bednarski, Nicholas E., 450-90-1740
Bell, Verle L., 370-58-4464
Benavidez, Norma L., 350-52-4002
Benge, James M., 507-64-6170
Berdeaux, Donald H., 267-94-5764
Berkowitz, Ellen K., 267-86-4981
Bertin, Anthony P., 276-44-7898
Best, George S., 459-90-0411
Bhardwaj, Rana V. K., 119-52-32[illegible]0
Blackman, Jacques D., 514-52-0586
Blancarte, Gilbert, 459-82-5906
Boling, Eugene P., 552-84-5504
Bond, Robert K., 254-92-5982
Boran, Kevin J., 193-42-7787
Briedenstein, Thomas J., 099-40-2655
Brink, Lela W., 137-44-2715
Bronstein, Michael S., 412-84-5942
Brown, David M., 458-76-9561
Brown, Edward F., 162-42-4116
Brown, Kenneth A., 544-60-7956
Browning, Kenneth C., 557-72-4284
Brownlee, Harrison J., Jr., 101-42-4319
Bujold, Edward J., 381-54-7321
Carruth, Cynthia W., 409-88-3821
Carter, Russell P., Jr., 567-72-7640
Chandler, Richard D., 456-80-3475
Chandramohan, Balakrishnan, 139-60-0684
Cheshire, Howard J., 288-50-7873
Chu, Robert L., 095-42-9159
Church, Tommie G., 332-40-6873
Coble, Walter R., 504-52-7966
Conner, William H., 258-82-4757
Coonley, Craig J., 106-44-0230
Cooper, Robert L., Jr., 522-64-0319
Copeland, Payton N., 493-56-9032
Cox, Foy W., 401-74-5535
Cox, Stephen H., 224-64-2990
Crouch, Steven W., 511-52-9945
Cuchia, John F., 462-80-3814
Dalton, Jep P., Jr., 417-62-1567
Davis, Joseph E., Jr., 249-82-6882
Deckard, Patty S., 573-02-2043
Dell, Robert V., 512-56-9633
Deloria, John E., 071-40-0610
Dennison, Alan D., 142-38-1003
Dhingra, Rahul K., 126-58-0066
Dickerson, Michael J., 270-46-2339
Diehl, Steven L., 212-54-8706
Dietrich, Larry M., 342-44-5579
Dietrick, Richard F., 189-42-0657
Donner, Elwin M., III, 436-72-8489
Drude, Richard B., Jr., 436-82-8190
Dumic, John F., 411-90-2492
Duncan, Charles A., 258-80-3939
Eaves, James B., 441-46-2294
Egelhoff, John C., 497-50-6150
Eggertsen, Sam C., 554-78-9436
Emrick, Fred G., 587-32-0470
Erickson, Fred W., 540-54-8639
Erickstad, John A., 502-54-2463
Espinel, Alfonso R., 102-50-6083
Evans, Richard A., 460-74-1933
Fajardo, Mario E., 372-52-5645
Figueroa, Edgar A., 583-26-2995
Fillman, Stephen D., 454-92-6751
Finkenstadt, John F., 117-38-0353
Fokakis, Arthur N., 425-98-6283
Frank, Howard W., Jr., 548-90-8743
Franklin, Gregory A., 440-54-7436
Fritz, Marc A., 372-50-8080
Furr, Wayne C., 556-88-7248
Gardner, Timothy J., 570-72-4418
Gillette, Robert K., 385-52-1641
Girton, Keith E., 292-44-4337
Glass, Larry T., 192-42-5690
Goff, Robert C., 174-40-5829
Goodman, Carey W., 265-04-1072
Goodstein, Richard S., 460-88-2756
Gordon, Jack C., 432-98-3249
Gould, William D., 378-48-4233
Grant Marshall W., 042-34-2916
Grant, Richard E., 313-54-8636
Greenwall, Kurt, 254-80-0178
Griffin, Sandra L., 562-68-0346
Groff, James W., 199-40-0178
Growney, James L., 524-64-4764
Hales, Stanley E., 539-46-8292
Hand, William A., Jr., 301-46-6525
Hankins, Gary D. V., 224-76-2812
Hardy, Joseph P., 529-62-8053
Harmon, Gerald E., 250-96-6527
Harrison, Charles R., 223-80-3047
Hauck, Arthur J., 507-70-4471
Hawkins, Robert A., 523-76-8969
Heironimus, James D., Jr., 278-46-2385
Hempstead, Richard W., 244-42-8362
Herrin, James R., 462-80-6138
Hildebrand, Michael E., 413-76-7794
Hill, Ralph K., Jr., 467-90-9141
Hjermstad, Brent M., 380-46-8647
Hoefer, Richard A., Jr., 057-40-5190
Holloway, Joshua R., Jr., 223-72-1409
Houk, Richard W., 408-88-1713
Hsu, Chih Chiang, 348-60-3544
Isbell, John P., 449-90-9640
Jackson, Michael D., 454-92-9922
Jacob, Bernd, 527-08-6925
Jacobi, Jay P., 447-48-9259
Jamali, Hamida, 446-58-9224
Jens, Daniel K., 532-46-9531
Jewitt, Thomas L., 503-66-7254
Johnson, Farris T., Jr., 258-74-9796
Kammerer, Donald J. F., 501-58-1291
Kelley, Joseph E., 337-48-2386
Kemmerlin, Richard W., 260-84-7058
Kerek, William B., 286-46-0130
Key, Webb B., Jr., 409-72-4421
Knaus, John V., Jr., 564-68-8294
Knox, Kirby E., 264-92-9424
Kunkel, Robert R., 494-58-5747
Kuskie, Michael R., 508-66-2215
LaFleur, Dan J., 439-84-7171
LaForce, William R., 522-72-2690
LaMasters, David L., 326-40-1408
Land, Jack A., Jr., 413-88-3569
Laser, Jeffrey A., 062-44-7292
Laub, Ronald M., 196-38-9781
Lawrence, Don A., 429-64-9316
Leavengood, Douglas C., 484-66-5990
LeCompte, Michael D., 358-40-4784
Lesko, Terrance D., 565-72-5779
Lieske, Timothy R., 505-70-9038
Llamas, Hernahope R., 480-80-9688
Loftus, Thomas J., 162-40-1717
Lores, Manuel E., 265-59-8510
Low, Gordon J., 262-94-3859
Lynch, Robert J., 145-40-6491
Manint, James E., 349-46-1985
Manis, Justine A. S., 422-66-6759
Manis, Peter M., 062-44-9607
Mariano, Mary I., 210-50-7129
Masten, James E., 275-44-9526
Matos, Luis A., 583-50-8371
Matthews, Calvin C., 240-76-3784
Mayer, Michael H., 536-54-4075
Mazza, Dominic L., 169-42-8188
McClure, Timothy M., 305-58-0495
McGlone, Thomas P., 523-66-9354
McKissick, Robert A., 509-48-0050
Mecca, Roger S., 126-40-1003
Messerschmidt, Gerald L., 543-60-3211
Meyer, Kenneth E., 265-92-5363
Michaud, Robert M., 565-80-2556
Miles, Curtis R., 415-88-8839
Mirkin, Dana B., 325-46-6319
Mitchell, Orderia F., 308-56-2771
Molina, Rodolfo, 454-90-5885
Moore, Patrick F., 502-54-1656
Morris, Ray D., II, 279-50-1482
Murphy, Alan R., 113-38-7640
Murray, Stephen T., 265-94-6075
Nall, John S., 570-84-7723
Nayak, Krishen K., 111-58-3621
Nehring, Kevin J., 374-54-0719
Nelson, Eustus S., 083-40-8992
Nelson, Thomas H., 517-54-3689
Neufeld, Gwynne K., 214-58-4113
Newman, John E., 587-44-1149
Newmark, Zephron G., 261-96-5247
Norwood, Scott H., 243-82-7577
Oksol, Bruce A., 501-56-2173

Olinger, Mark B., 394-46-5448
Page, Wayne C., 444-52-3385
Pak, Byong J., 142-42-4571
Parham, Fred W., 445-54-7247
Park, Eil B., 192-52-8217
Parry, Edward L., 462-78-2364
Parry, Morgan W., 529-78-0837
Parsons, Marshal, R., 585-36-2691
Patel, Indumati B., 310-72-6826
Payne, Hernando C., 587-38-7860
Pearce, Jane V., 544-54-5840
Penix, Arnold R., 301-48-7218
Perry, David B., 444-48-6165
Perry, Lee C., 364-56-2650
Persing, Ronald E., 503-54-6226
Pfeifer, Bernard A., 148-38-4142
Phillips, Gerald H., 302-38-5873
Pinell, Michael C., 568-74-7683
Pokorski, Robert J., 503-70-0077
Polhamus, Clinton D., 567-80-7109
Powell, Jack B., Jr., 415-84-9292
Prechter, Gary C., 259-72-3883
Preston, Jack M., 323-44-7812
Putnam, Richard L., 561-84-7679
Rainge, Ronnie, 370-46-3728
Ranzenberger, Steven S., 524-58-9472
Redeker, Charles C., 523-54-7222
Reveronquestell, Edmundo, 583-28-8026
Riddell, Mal S., III, 587-01-9928
Riedy, Melissa J., 203-44-9214
Roberts, Donald L., Jr., 426-96-4377
Roberts, Larry C., 453-86-6842
Roberts, Larry K., 414-84-9021
Roth, Earl E., Jr., 433-82-0619
Sachdeva, Vinod K., 259-15-5880
Sanderson, Thomas W., 421-64-2507
Sanner, Patricia H., 285-46-1761
Santaana, Rolando R., 561-86-6556
Sawyer, Kenneth D., 519-58-0319
Schenk, David A., 351-40-6453
Schooler, Garth S., 467-84-5135
Schuricht, Wayne E., 206-34-0592
Schwiger, Paul A., Jr., 415-82-3887
Scruggs, Michael C., 240-86-6329
Seaworth, Barbara J., 471-58-5413
Sewchand, Joel, 579-74-2893
Shagets, Frank W., 496-54-4159
Shaw, Robert D., 481-64-3219
Shepherd, James R., III, 456-80-6007
Sherman, Ronald W., 462-82-9881
Sheth, Suresh V., 082-56-9077
Shields, Eugene R., 526-70-8876
Sidlinger, Robert L., 511-52-5062
Sievert, Dwight W., 392-56-4317
Silverberg, Daniel M., 186-38-0375
Smith, David C., 542-50-2360
Smith, Don W., 437-66-0043
Smolowitz, Edwin L., 053-40-5560
Soppet, Charles M., 530-46-3525
Sosinski, Richard F., 513-52-2119
Soto, Rodolfo C., 200-38-1383
Spencer, Cory D., 549-88-3166
Sreecharana, Thimmavajjhala, 151-60-7233
Stasko, Thomas, 461-88-3352
Steel, John G., 244-84-5844
Steward, Kendall L., 252-86-0529
Stine, Walter S., 287-44-8958
Stoddard, Ronald A., 528-64-6559
Stone, Kurt A., 392-56-1839
Stoughton Ned S., 556-66-8429
Stuart, Robert J., 453-80-9975
Suarino, Douglas C., 548-70-8315
Suchomski, Gerald D., 319-46-4285
Suryaprasad, Seetha G., 478-34-7106
Telep, Gerald N. J., 526-72-8812
Thomas, Roy E., Jr., 266-82-2220
Thurman, Francis W., 412-78-7086
Tignor, Matthew, 227-64-0557
Tilma, Geurt L., Jr., 459-58-9075
Trivedi, Devendra V., 154-60-3560
Tuason, Florentino M., 361-50-2397
Tucker, Bobby F., 459-84-6691
Vann, Kenneth C., 474-58-4492
Veale, Charles J., 418-64-2605
Vermeire, Calvin L., Jr., 201-42-8454
Vicente, Doroteo A., 262-65-2816
Vinh, Dai, 586-40-6425
Vinh, Tuyethoa N., 586-40-6436
Vinson, Thomas L., 587-01-5049
Vogler, James B., III, 505-66-4413
Walburn, David J., 585-38-0089
Warriner, Robert A., III, 436-72-6392
Watson, Roosevelt, 265-80-3989
Watters, Leslie C., 256-86-0862
Weinholt, Francis E., Jr., 451-82-6874
Weitzenkamp, Larry A., 506-52-3250
Wesley, Howard D., 557-88-0808
Wheeler, Charles H., 454-90-1609
Whigham, Cliff J., Jr., 464-80-7091
Whiting, Mark A., 407-62-7616
Whitney, Edwin J., 220-54-0173
Williams, Michael K., 455-90-4279
Wohlrab, Eric P., 348-42-0254
Wolfe, Sanford M., 294-44-0149
Wood, John D., 483-56-6711
Woods, Gerald M., 489-54-0720
Wright, John E., 456-94-5191
Yates, Robert L., 430-98-5156
Zen, Bujung, 145-58-3155
Zimmerman, Donald A., 395-48-8836

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 531, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duty indicated, with grades and dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force in accordance with section 533, title 10, United States Code.

MEDICAL CORPS

Liang, Chang Y., 261-58-6934
McDonald, Edward C., 378-52-8318
Shaffer, Paul J., 397-32-1876

The following-named officer for permanent promotion in the U.S. Air Force, in accordance with section 603, title VI, Transition Provision, Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Johnson, Frank L. 37[illegible]-50-7105

The following-named officer for permanent promotion in the U.S. Air Force, in accordance with section 628, title 10, United States Code, as amended with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Laipple, Douglas K., 185-34-9497

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air National Guard of the U.S. officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Air Force under the provisions of section 593(a) title 10 of the United States Code, as amended:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James H. Andrews, 315-40-3103
Maj. Brian E. Barents, 373-42-9438
Maj. Charles J. Bowling, 408-72-2996
Maj. Richard E. Casberg, 533-34-5149
Maj. Robert W. Harper, 326-36-4264
Maj. Larry L. Lee, 289-36-3963
Maj. Robert G. Robuck, 160-34-7213
Maj. Hobbie L. Sealy, 420-58-0657
Maj. George L. Weinhagen, 396-34-3438
Maj. James S. Williams, 255-54-2269

LEGAL

Maj. Timothy J. Lowenberg, 483-50-7542

MEDICAL CORPS

Maj. Madhu Thakker, 024-42-1952

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisons of section 531, title 10, United States Code, with grades and dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Andrews, Curtis C., 147-44-5857
York, Ken C., 565-86-7918

The following officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 531, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with grades and dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force in accordance with section 533, title 10, United States Code.

MEDICAL CORPS

Dozier, Kenneth C., 411-76-9476
Figueroa, Edgar A., 583-26-2995
Marks, Donald H., 565-78-1254
Montalvo-Gonzalez, Miguel A., 583-46-2818
Odell, Stanley E., 489-36-6766
Perez-Figaredo, Rafael A., 583-12-5876

DENTAL CORPS

Brandt, Debra, 571-86-0201
Burgess, John O., 296-42-3386
Hansen-Bayless, Jeanne H., 452-76-3294
Law, John H., 546-82-1579
Marttala, Warren H., 537-32-8507
Parmann, Donald F., 560-58-5000
Pearson, Bryan S., 140-42-9017
Waldbillig, Tom T., 388-36-1675

NURSE CORPS

Aaron, Janice C., 403-58-6900
Fitzgerald, John W., 267-66-7320
Franklin, Kathleen S., 156-24-1297
Heitman, Lois A., 506-42-9923

The following persons for appointment as Reserve of the Air Force, in grade indicated, under the provisions of section 593, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Beatty, Douglas C., 256-72-6035
Berman, Merrill I., 216-34-6445
Boyce, Alfred E., 092-32-1749
Ditmore, Harry B., Jr., 238-42-2431
Ettinger, Marvin M., 437-42-1967
Fulton, Robert L., 270-32-8680
Gould, Robert E., 121-18-6335
Harrington, John L., 190-20-3122
Lambert, Robert M., 441-38-8088
Luff, Ronald D., 180-38-3588
Phillips, Jasper L., Jr., 239-48-8906
Spivey, James N., 247-26-5571
Wade, Billy K., 431-86-2227

DENTAL CORPS

Meyer, Kamp R., 504-44-4041

The following persons for appointment as Reserve of the Air Force (ANGUS) in the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 593 and 8351, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Masloski, John F., 110-28-5971
Stewart, Calvin R., 293-30-2844

The following officers for promotion in the Air Force Reserve, under the provision of section 8376, title 10, United States Code. (Non-EAD)

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Bouda, David W., 505-58-8081
Moore, George W., 443-46-7379
Steele, Norman P., Jr., 474-50-6474

The following-named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Air Force, in accordance with section 601, title VI, Transition Provisions, Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Jacobcik, John D., 296-30-8445

To be lieutenant colonel

Holin, Lyle M., 474-42-0543

To be major

Mucha, Ronald R., 155-30-5100

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Donnelly, Maurice W., 147-22-0851
Roehrig, Kenneth L., 280-32-5510

The following-named Air Force officers for reappointment to the Active Duty List of the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be captain

Fredericksen, Marian F., 576-56-7626
Plummer, Benjamin E., 384-48-4334

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Army, in accordance with sections 601 and 602, title VI, Transition Provisions, Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be major

Aaron, Alvin D., 263-86-8500
Abrahamson, Dale M., 519-54-8819
Absher, Charles W., 229-72-4031
Ackerman, John M., 429-98-9242
Acuff, Ronald D., 434-76-9230
Adams, Charles J., 048-42-2237
Adams, Christopher A., 449-74-9490
Adams, Gerald L., 347-42-2343
Adams, Melvin E., 231-58-3761
Adams, Rodney A., 557-60-4447
Adams, Ronald E., 005-46-6741
Adams, Roosevelt, Jr., 249-80-6902
Adams, William B., 031-34-3529
Adams, William G., 430-88-6491
Adelman, Joseph A., 223-72-0795
Aguilar, Donald, 462-80-0115
Aiba, Daniel K., 559-72-4599
Aiken, James D., 107-36-5431
Ainsworth, James L., 520-52-7937
Alberg, Wayne C., 552-66-6617
Albro, Scott T., 512-54-2406
Alf, Frederick W., Jr., 532-46-2166
Allen, Johnny D., 405-70-5561
Allen, Kenneth R., 383-48-3964
Allenbach, Stephen E., 420-64-0366
Allison, Barry L., 408-80-0273
Allison, James B., III, 429-90-3857
Allum, Philip D., 304-50-7749
Amacher, Aaron G., Jr., 228-68-8417
Anchondo, Robert L., 455-82-2491
Anders, Howard G., Jr., 192-38-4017
Andersen, Robert L., 504-48-4236
Anderson, Edward J., 417-64-3125
Anderson, John K., 364-50-1196
Anderson, Robert J., 550-74-0505
Anderson, William F., 554-80-0872
Andre, Charles R., 203-38-9373
Andrews, William R., 058-38-6170
Antosh, Raymond H., 265-82-9119
Archer, William D., 012-42-1306
Ards, Donald D., 461-86-0398
Armbruster, Robert E., Jr., 071-42-8136
Armogida, Charles J., 559-82-7115
Armstrong, Robert N., 426-96-7718
Arney, David C., 124-38-6819
Arnold, Archibald V., II, 275-42-8196
Arsenault, Robert J., 552-82-2424
Arteaga, Roland A., 452-86-5753
Asher, David S., 409-78-3426
Atchley, Larry J., 486-54-0267
Axson, Harry B., Jr., 248-90-8396
Ayers, Charles M., 403-72-7361
Bach, Bruce F., 065-38-2569
Bacher, James W., II, 060-42-3431
Backlund, William V., Jr., 381-52-6560
Baer, John R., 228-72-3099
Baldenweck, Thomas K., 498-46-0655
Ballard, Bryant L., 517-56-8049
Banning, Robert F., 255-78-6007
Bantsolas, John N., 340-40-5421
Bapple, James W., III, 571-84-5026
Barber, George F., 402-72-3683
Barbuto, Richard V., 076-40-7044
Barker, Jefferson H., 379-46-5895
Barker, Larry N., 467-76-6851
Barkovic, William J., 222-28-6440
Barneby, Stephen A., 530-32-8828
Barnett, James O., 500-48-9628
Barnum, Thomas I., 155-34-3783
Bartlett, Joseph T., 464-76-4413
Bates, Norman W., 036-32-4496
Batson, Charles F., III, 431-86-0558
Bauer, Benjamin, 217-50-4822
Baxter, Michael J., 576-52-0245
Beard, Michael W., 316-50-4961
Bearden, William A., Jr., 455-88-2631
Beaver, David O., 297-44-5621
Beckwith, James L., 511-54-0825
Beech, George W., 424-54-6926
Beeks, Gary H., 251-72-4999
Beer, John M., 467-76-7264
Beeson, Terry D., 463-88-0519
Beisner, James W., 392-48-0417
Beliveau, Philip R., 015-36-9519
Bell, Leo Jr., 460-74-5207
Bell, Ronald K., 432-90-6207
Benedict, William, 008-34-9371
Benedict, Calvert P., Jr., 245-76-8500
Bennett, Ronald L., 404-68-2489
Beno, Joseph H., Jr., 556-82-9795
Bergtholdt, Gary B., 561-72-7881
Berkowitz, James W., 429-84-0923
Berry, Guy A., Jr., 470-56-6531
Berry, Harvey W., 430-92-9238
Berry, Luther W., 458-88-2835
Berry, Thomas P., 530-30-7077
Bertrand, Gary T., 030-38-3194
Beyer, Walter R., III, 263-96-5780
Biggs, Michael E., 230-66-3604
Bilbo, Jon F., 228-62-2972
Bilyj, Myron, 068-40-8994
Biser, Kenneth M., 389-42-2992
Bishop, Robert H., 073-38-4275
Bisulca, Paul J., 006-48-6367
Black, Donald E., 447-48-4700
Blackburn, John W., 414-80-9694
Blair, Patrick R., 236-66-5468
Blake, Robert T., Jr., 442-50-4516
Blanding, Willie L., Jr., 249-84-0571
Blanding, Zenola B., 249-84-0495
Blindauer, Denis M., 503-60-2565
Blissett, William G., 364-50-2200
Blount, Buford C., III, 217-52-5012
Blount, Kerry A., 522-68-2393
Boice, Lawrence R., 517-54-0364
Bolton, Michael L., 513-54-5456
Bond, John M., 454-82-8765
Bonham, Lyle V., 226-72-5471
Borcheller, Otis D., 212-56-9266
Borchers, Alan L., 480-54-7961
Bort, Roger E., 218-52-9608
Borum, Benton H., Jr., 372-54-4475
Bowab, Joseph W., 227-68-3942
Bowles, Raymond S., 212-46-8800
Bowman, Rodger M., 439-70-9267
Bowns, Nicolas D., 169-40-8310
Boyatt, Mark D., 412-82-0974
Boyers, William B., 216-50-1659
Bracey, Hugh M., 263-86-3667
Bracey, Stephen W., 263-86-3691
Bradley, Billy R., 417-58-7529
Brady, Raymond M., Jr., 458-68-0109
Brady, Steven J., 475-52-3815
Brantley, Andrew W., 246-74-4971
Bratton, John M., 493-48-9106
Brayshaw, John E., 262-82-0854
Brazzeal, Richard T., Jr., 260-72-8616
Breithaupt, Micheal P., 566-72-0784
Bremer, August W., Jr., 231-64-2944
Brennan, Kevin F., Jr., 102-40-0875
Brenner, Philip J., 385-48-8913
Brent, Charles H., 433-76-6695
Bridges, Richard M., 302-46-7584
Brieske, Carl W., 270-44-4347
Briggs, Kenneth L., 519-48-0559
Brinckmann, Karen A., 229-66-3730
Broaddus, Gregory D., 227-72-8365
Brock, Edwin R., Jr., 408-82-8495
Broderick, John D., 252-78-7541
Brooks, James, 569-76-1858
Brooks, Johnny W., 409-80-4014
Brophy, William S., III, 574-18-7133
Broster, Michael R., 303-60-4903
Brown, Donald H., Jr., 156-42-4461
Brown, Fred E., 430-90-5600
Brown, John S., 223-74-2041
Brown, Leslie D., 086-36-4192
Brown, Stephen D., 558-82-5915
Brown, William C., 406-62-6611
Bryan, William H., Jr., 258-76-4906
Buchanan, John R., 443-42-6479
Buchanan, William R., 040-44-0551
Buck, Randolph O., 547-68-4805
Buggert, Donn J., 471-60-5964
Buie, Ralph M., 434-70-2464
Bunyea, Walter L., 113-38-1993
Burleson, Jean F., 421-62-7244
Burnett, John R., 029-40-4153
Burns, Timothy J., 420-66-0943
Burrell, Thomas F., III, 565-74-1117
Buske, Ronald L., 499-48-5425
Butto, Robert J., 125-40-6504
Button, Patrick W., 230-68-6372
Cahoon, Robert M., 044-38-4348
Calabro, David J., 191-38-9133
Callaway, David G., 245-76-9172
Campbell, Thomas A., 575-46-0864
Candido, Robert H., 040-42-9927
Cantu, Jose N., 462-88-6378
Capka, Joseph R., 218-54-7021
Cappelletti, Siro A., 183-38-5586
Carden, John M., 257-80-5767
Carden, William J., III, 415-78-8247
Cardine, Christopher V., 194-40-0983
Carey, William F., III, 093-40-6353
Carleton, Bruce., 432-84-6440
Carley, John C., 225-70-2571
Carpenter, Ronald W., Jr., 116-38-7863
Carroll, Michael G., 454-86-8697
Carter, Arnold W., 407-70-4191
Carter, Jeffrey C., 263-86-8042
Cartwright, Jess A., 315-52-2255
Cascio, Anthony F., Jr., 045-42-7773
Casey, James M., 424-66-5921
Casey, Judith A., 512-46-6941
Cash, Dean W., 506-66-1289
Castle, Samuel Q., Jr., 413-78-7696
Caswell, Kenneth L., 379-52-6038
Cathcart, Creston M., 452-82-9775
Catlin, John D., 338-40-6404
Cerami, Joseph R., 099-40-9432
Chabot, Joseph L., 260-78-9907
Chambers, Michael S., 415-80-3235
Chappel, Oscar A., 374-48-9251
Cherry, Atwood C., 460-68-8732
Chiacchia, Leonard A., Jr., 011-40-4810
Chidester, Earl J., 552-68-5182
Chrisco, Larry D., 493-50-1836
Christianson, Claude V., 501-54-1982
Clagett, David C., Jr., 558-72-0764
Clark, Michael D., 585-18-8504
Clark, Paul L., 521-64-3331
Clark, Russell L., Jr., 077-36-9875
Clarke, George C., 231-68-7496
Clarke, James C., 060-38-3281
Clarkson, Charles J., 260-76-2940
Claxton, George M., 540-56-3893
Clifton, Herbert C., 118-38-8480
Cloney, Leroy V., 042-36-8289
Clubb, Frank W., 010-38-3982
Coaker, Charles D., 384-44-7347
Cochran, Barry J., 088-38-7094
Coffin, Richard H., Jr., 139-40-8541
Cogan, Kevin J., 157-42-4152

Colasanti, James W., 526-68-0192
Collignon, Larry J., 504-54-0898
Collins, Richard F., 570-70-9595
Columbus, Allan D., 432-90-0701
Colvin, James M., Jr., 256-76-9475
Comeau, Ronald J., 262-64-8097
Conner, Larry J., 222-32-7547
Contrucci, Joel J., 160-42-2516
Cooper, John W., 496-52-6508
Cornett, Terry L., 456-78-6494
Couch, Timothy H., 461-68-1663
Cox, Dennis W., 230-66-4387
Cox, James H., Jr., 221-36-8105
Crabtree, Donald J., 553-68-3977
Craddock, Bantz J., 235-78-7782
Craft, Charles W., Jr., 101-42-7954
Craft, Robert L., Jr., 520-48-9545
Craven, Douglas R., 231-68-1424
Crossett, Michael L., 478-52-2165
Crossman, Thomas E., 536-48-5033
Crouse, Robin W., Jr., 585-24-2940
Crowe, James A., 503-52-1840
Culbert, James D., 452-76-1272
Cullina, William J., 010-40-7176
Cumberworth, Charles C., 291-48-9294
Cummins, Gerald F., Jr., 090-36-9192
Cunningham, Daniel R., 533-52-8780
Curran, Stephen B., 116-38-2855
Currier, Edward F., 013-40-3115
Curry, Joseph P., III, 340-42-5852
Cushman, George H., V, 267-04-9134
Dailey, Dell L., 433-80-3747
Dallas, Edward D., 240-84-1644
Dandries, Michael I., 101-40-0165
Daniel, Scott N., 219-50-6664
Daniel, Virgildee 278-46-9599
Daniels, Robert W., 516-52-8381
Danish, George A., 170-40-7065
Davidson, James W., 536-50-0439
Davis, Frank C., III, 259-74-1231
Davis, James H., 223-64-9654
Davis, Scott L., 535-52-8030
Davis, Thomas C., 418-64-3259
Dearmon. Lawrence J., 421-70-0469
Deas, Alfred Jr., 246-80-1150
Deca, James A. 279-42-3180
Decker, Timonthy, J., 392-52-0354
Decola, Gary T., 454-78-2786
Decola, Gerald A., 454-78-2784
Dejesus, Rafael 259-74-9367
Delary, James L., 009-36-9736
Delashaw, James M., 262-86-2390
Del Corso, Robert E., 268-46-3739
Deluca, Thomas A., 409-64-2516
Demoney, Jerry A., 511-46-3315
Demoya, Richard G., 177-42-1865
Dempsey, John M., 173-40-2664
Dempsey, Richard F., 156-40-4775
Denny, Dennis P., 538-46-7256
Denny, Morgan F., 068-38-3893
Deperro, Peter J., 117-40-3292
Depue, Ronald D., 585-30-2364
Devault, Dean L., 504-50-2250
Diamond, James M., 200-38-1311
Dibbert, Bernard, W., 242-74-3778
Dicken, Keith H., 515-50-3531
Diehl, William F., 471-56-2674
Diekema, Larry A., 380-48-6741
Dietrich, Gordon S., 201-38-7022
Dietrich, James D., 512-48-7268
Dikeman, Lawrence B., 154-38-1594
Dinwiddie, Rubin Jr., 431-92-5956
Distephano, Anthony 080-42-7224
Dixon, William B., 430-92-7643
Doan, Charles A., 465-76-2983
Dombrowski, William M., 424-64-9892
Donley, Freemon R., 251-82-4046
Donnells, James M., Jr., 123-36-4225
Donnelly, Robert T., 082-42-6292
Dovich, John J., Jr., 031-34-0486
Dow, Philip B., 218-52-7068
Dowdy, Carlton L., 231-66-7763
Doyle, John P., 072-38-1509
Doyne, William G., 159-38-2080
Dreher, Lawrence J., 106-38-8111
Dries, James E., 167-40-3218
Drouillard, Mark C., 385-52-2838
Dube, Timothy J., 047-42-8981
Duble, Keith T., 151-40-7414
Duckworth, Roger L., 282-44-8345
Dudley, Thomas D., Jr., 228-68-2580
Dunfield, William B., 530-30-4587
Dunham, Jimmy D., 460-82-4854
Dunn, Martin A., 457-84-2805
Dunn, Michael D., 370-48-0060
Durden, Richard L., 254-80-0044
Durgala, John T., Jr., 079-42-2622
Duval, Jean J., 071-40-2328
Dyne, Thomas F., 116-38-9512
Edwards, Donald L., 373-50-6124
Edwards, Roy T., 521-60-8348
Egan, Edward P., III, 417-72-5897
Egan, James A., 214-52-0646
Egan, Michael C., 302-48-7386
Eichling, Robert E., Jr., 442-46-5727
Eller, Jay B., 221-30-3046
Elliott, Robert V., 509-54-7712
Ellis, Neil W., 453-78-7851
Emerson, Harry M., III, 517-52-5101
Emig, John T., 288-38-0875
Engberg, Harry A., 504-50-8852
Engel, William F., 226-68-8868
Engels, Keith H., 504-60-4526
Ensman, Timothy A., 294-42-0725
Erlandson, Marcus R., 477-50-2032
Estrella, Alfred J., Jr., 038-32-9172
Ettner, Edward R., Jr., 230-66-3606
Evanko, Stanley K., 298-46-1548
Evans, John W., Jr., 091-38-9245
Evans, Thad H., 446-46-6505
Eyster, George S., V, 575-50-9139
Fagan, James D., Jr., 056-36-0851
Faint, Donald R., 420-70-3883
Fairall, James P., Jr., 235-74-2088
Fannin, Danny R., 400-76-4134
Favati, Richard F., 259-82-9568
Fay, Keith L., 527-72-7177
Feiertag, John P., 325-38-4313
Felt, David D., 529-68-9361
Fenwick, Douglas L., 560-68-5956
Ferguson, Comadora M., 415-82-8060
Ferguson, Thomas K., 010-38-4951
Ferris, Daniel J., 219-48-8757
Fisher, Peter B., 137-40-7496
Fisher, Robert C., II, 202-36-3355
Fisher, Stephen L., 303-50-0391
Fitton, Robert A., Jr., 375-50-7766
Fitzgerald, Edward J., II, 082-38-7543
Fitzgerald, William P., 126-40-4886
Fitzharris, Leo J., III, 155-38-9284
Flanagan, Stephen A., 361-42-3867
Fleming, John W., 245-80-2429
Fojt, Alan S., 298-46-1130
Foltz, John R., 182-40-3811
Fontenot, Gregory, 510-52-4518
Forbes, Marlin G., Jr., 458-84-8564
Forest, Jonathan N., 025-40-4777
Fornwalt, Mark A., 211-38-1099
Forster, John R., Jr., 542-54-7107
Forsyth, Frederick A., 224-68-2841
Forth, Lyle E., 444-42-3052
Fortson, James F., Jr., 260-78-1578
Foster, Guy A., 094-36-9606
Foster, Steven C., 256-76-0776
Fothergill, William C., 012-42-8193
Fowler, Donald E., II, 175-40-5894
Frankenfield, Thomas R., 197-38-1477
Freeman, Robert E., 452-78-4528
Freytes, Dennis O., 584-16-8273
Friar, Frank A., 416-70-9350
Frick, Lynn A., 504-60-3689
Frink, Jack C., 500-48-3636
Fromm, Jerome M., 565-64-2746
Fuentes, Robert M., 111-34-6738
Fulcher, Cecil N., 231-70-5492
Fullerton, Terrence D., 229-66-2041
Gaar, Richard E., 217-50-8558
Galbreath, Robert D., 412-74-1920
Gajewski, Michael A., 348-38-4356
Gallagher, Herbert J., 204-38-0011
Gallatin, Randy C., 271-46-4256
Gant, Charles L., Jr., 461-74-1589
Gardner, Alan M., 421-66-6065
Gardner, Mack B., 231-68-6390
Garren, Patrick E., 460-78-9410
Gatanas, Harry D., 131-34-5957
Gevin, Frank C., 522-62-6379
Genton, Robert E., 082-38-1799
Gentry, John E., 460-80-9494
George, Gary L., 486-52-7442
Gibbs, Joe B., Jr., 256-76-2580
Gibson, Douglas F., 296-46-4564
Gibson, William D., III, 014-40-5694
Gilbert, Raybon, 585-12-6832
Giles, Wilbur C., Jr., 212-56-9952
Gill, Donald T., 406-72-6304
Gillman, John W., 046-40-4920
Gingrich, John R., 552-76-2831
Girouard, Theodor J., III, 228-70-2449
Gleisberg, James W., 420-62-9027
Godwin, James B., Jr., 267-82-5887
Goebeler, John A., 076-40-9703
Goeke, Joseph C., 344-40-1483
Golden, Kim B., 266-90-6182
Goldsmith, Paul E., 421-62-7554
Gongaware, Kenneth C., 159-42-7067
Gooch, Dennis C., 529-70-5685
Gorres, Roger L., 473-54-8009
Gottardi, Larry D., 195-38-1032
Goulette, James P., 005-50-3252
Grabowski, Michael N., 264-98-3574
Grafton, Charles F., 286-46-0820
Grantham, Donald G., 513-50-4720
Gravatt, Arthur B., III, 229-56-4921
Graves, Eric E., 167-40-4847
Graves, Shawn F., 517-60-9663
Gravish, Joseph M., 168-36-4749
Gray, Danny T., 429-90-6936
Grazioplene, James J., 096-38-3304
Green, Charles J., 465-80-6901
Green, Lloyd T., Jr., 265-82-0727
Greenberg, Lawrence M., 265-84-6433
Greene, Byron D., III, 252-82-1573
Greene, Edward E., Jr., 146-42-3227
Greer, Warren A., 585-32-4437
Griffith, Michael C., 450-72-1598
Grimes, Walter B., III, 237-76-2260
Grissett, John M., 424-64-7490
Grover, Joel M., 419-62-0785
Grussmeyer, Jimmy R., 567-74-0127
Guillory, Kenneth D., 437-72-6998
Guissanie, Gary D., 146-40-8829
Gunlicks, James B., 506-58-9886
Hackett, Craig D., 552-76-5451
Hackman, Benjamin C., 208-38-2025
Hafkemeyer, George F., III, 458-80-6572
Hagan, Richard G., 523-52-3620
Hagans, Harold L., Jr., 228-62-2476
Hagenbeck, Franklin L, 267-84-3956
Haggard, Brian K., 527-72-2265
Hale, Ronald L., 518-52-0556
Hall, Clark C., 511-56-4108
Hall, Janice R., 454-76-3741
Hall, Wayne M., 506-58-3289
Hamer, John R., 255-68-2958
Hanna, Tom, 151-38-4566
Hannah, John H., III, 267-86-8885
Hansen, Lynn S., 502-54-2740
Hanson, Robert L., Jr., 221-34-6886
Hardin, David E., 463-54-1621
Hardin, Michael R., 464-82-7510
Harke, Jerry R., 444-46-4248
Harpole, Jan H., 401-72-6966
Harris, Darrell W., 323-80-0425
Harris, Douglas M., 550-74-0340
Harris, Grant, 419-64-2270
Harris, Michael R., 347-42-6660
Harrison, Mark E., 155-40-1857
Harrison, Sandy E., 442-48-1517
Harrison, Steven D., 089-42-8606
Hart, Richard M., Jr., 248-84-5480
Hartley, Thomas A., 545-86-8402
Hartline, Richard Y., 213-54-4787
Hartsell, Hubert L., 430-96-8996
Harvey, Thomas N., 505-62-5749
Hatchett, William H., 442-46-7233
Hayashida, Sander S., 558-84-4418
Hayden, Lewell P., 438-76-6704
Hayes, Edward B., 258-84-0832
Hayes, James B., Jr., 146-40-0664
Hayes, Richard E., 371-52-4629
Hayes, Robert L., 271-40-9245
Haygood, Andrew B., 258-82-8388

Haynes, Kenneth N., 133-38-6958
Hazelton, Cornell J., 250-76-2831
Hedtke, Roy R., 387-48-7905
Heinz, Walter E., 155-40-9077
Helmerson, Stephen P., 221-30-6673
Helton, Howard L., 442-48-7430
Hemingway, David F., 585-24-6629
Henley, Charles W., 431-84-2802
Herald, David A., 407-66-9783
Heringer, Wayne L., 555-70-5743
Herzik, David L., 555-74-5168
Hess, Michael E., 359-42-7265
Heuser, Gary E., 572-72-7958
Hickok, James N., II, 228-72-3140
Hill, Gerald L., 208-30-2318
Hilliard, David W., 526-90-7960
Hillman, James L., 524-56-9130
Hinton, Daniel E., Sr., 079-40-6939
Hirsch, John S., 504-60-2488
Hitchcock, Frederick G., 465-82-4849
Hitchcock, Lee W., 114-34-1307
Hockensmith, Phillip B., 495-54-6569
Hoffmeyer, James H., 382-42-5672
Holcomb, Henry G., 252-82-6209
Holden, Leonard P., Jr., 437-76-4505
Holden, Philip W., 577-62-8752
Holden, William T., Jr., 011-40-3142
Holder, Danny G., 411-74-9720
Holland, Ronald M., 551-72-7330
Hollar, Reinhardt, 267-78-4370
Holley, Charles S., 416-60-3715
Honeycutt, Randall J., 404-72-0936
Honore, Russel L., 438-66-9939
Hood, Carlton L., 256-76-1358
Hoover, David R., 072-38-9505
Hopkin, Mac M., 458-74-3709
Hopkins, Elwyn V., Jr., 256-72-1287
Horan, Linda M., 563-64-1021
Horton, James J., 472-54-3925
Horvath, William C., 288-40-0876
Hotze, William R., 197-40-2019
Householder, Gary E., 408-84-3885
Howard, Alfred N., Jr., 230-70-5300
Howard, Joseph P., 024-38-2353
Howe, Edward E., 026-36-7396
Howell, Russell B., 527-86-1848
Howes, Patrick M., 272-48-5534
Howrey, Edward L., 466-74-6932
Huddleston, Louis D., 240-86-3400
Hudoba, Frank C., Jr., 468-58-6837
Huff, Reid S., 175-38-1699
Hughes, Zina L., 223-68-9708
Hulme, David F., 546-78-2467
Humphrey, Harlan L., 503-54-4210
Hunn, Jack D., 365-46-6982
Hunter, Michael B., 040-44-0111
Hunter Tyranny A., 262-84-5094
Hunter, William C., Jr., 584-34-2975
Hurd, Charles W., Jr., 546-72-4579
Hussey, William V., 505-58-9104
Hutchison, David S., 576-54-4476
Iacchei, Joseph A., 037-32-8654
Iaconis, Christopher S.,032-32-2893
Ihrke, Paul W., 461-80-3955
Isaacs, Tony A., 408-80-5917
Ishii, Melvin Y., 260-84-5728
Isom, James H., 571-80-1713
Jackson, Michael H., 576-58-2085
Jacobson, Robert M., 469-58-1380
James, Dennis E., 551-80-3389
James, Kevin T., 115-40-2189
Janecek, Frank P., 299-44-3090
Jankowski, Lisa T., 393-48-4817
Jansure, Raymond W., 211-38-7272
Jaynes, Robert H., Jr., 414-76-1336
Jefferis, John L., 442-46-8079
Jeffery, Arthur B., Jr., 421-66-6715
Jeffrey, Dennis J., 013-40-4370
Jemiola, Richard W., 156-40-2576
Jenckes, Joseph D., 369-52-7850
Jensen, Christopher D., 456-78-9058
Jensen, Neal R., 477-56-1065
Jessup, Bruce W., 523-62-1455
Jessup, Terry M., 445-40-0932
Johnson, Berner R., Jr., 569-72-2863
Johnson, Craig A., 511-52-9296
Johnson, Dennis R., 510-48-2539
Johnson, Donald B., 227-74-0227
Johnson, Hal M., 402-64-8465
Johnson, James F., III, 266-96-9098
Johson, Michael T., 018-36-1071
Jolley, Beverley C., Jr., 548-60-0992
Jolly, Michael G., 538-42-8556
Jones, Clinton C., 260-84-4019
Jones, Jerry V., 411-60-3668
Jones, Robert C., 397-44-3865
Jones, Roger C., 499-46-6195
Jones, Samuel H., III, 362-02-2773
Jones, William A., 152-40-9730
Jones, William S., Jr., 232-78-9165
Jordan, Robert L., Jr., 551-66-0241
Jorgensen, Terrill M., 504-56-8967
Jorrey, Douglas R., 055-40-7763
Jowell, Myrl B., 447-46-8734
Juskowiak, Gary L., 252-82-1218
Kaleta, Alexander J., Jr., 310-52-3112
Kaminski, Walter J., Jr., 173-38-0675
Kaster, Edward L., Jr., 273-46-2945
Kaufman, David A., 431-82-8592
Kazmierczak, Thomas E., 131-38-4896
Keehan, Mark P., 350-38-1993
Keenan, John M., 520-54-4185
Keenan, Leo E., III, 115-42-8539
Keene, Richard T., 108-40-2781
Keirsey, Jim D., 403-62-6444
Kelley, Chris P., 262-68-8712
Kelley, Jerome F., 231-74-7216
Kendall, Frank, III, 020-36-5390
Kendall, John M., 254-76-1777
Kendall, Ray J., 009-36-0505
Keneally, John T., 156-40-4921
Kent, Richard F., Jr., 424-66-7852
Keown, Roy D., 405-70-8713
Kerrins, Richard D., Jr., 135-40-2987
Kessler, David F., 254-72-2171
Killgore, Houston T., Jr., 412-82-5458
Kimel, Michael L., 244-80-0990
Kindsvatter, Peter S., 165-42-9153
King, David R., 210-40-6134
King, James R., 004-50-6627
Kingseed, Cole C., 298-42-6953
Kipers, James H., 134-40-1186
Kirkpatrick, Charles E., 245-72-9562
Kirtland, William B., 266-86-6416
Kitchell, Joseph W., Jr., 147-38-3139
Kitt, Timothy T., 573-82-0737
Kjellstrom, Richard E., 513-50-9517
Klevecz, John A., 048-38-2136
Klink, Ralph R., 391-50-4222
Kloster, Martin G., 504-60-3867
Knight, Alphonso W., Jr., 498-52-4119
Knight, James F., 400-66-0130
Knight, Kenneth R., 453-78-3245
Knowles, John T., Jr., 228-64-6488
Knox, Thomas R., 261-02-3867
Koch, David M., 450-84-9599
Koenig, Dale L., 502-52-8773
Konieczko, Daniel S., 007-46-2085
Konopka, Gary W., 360-40-2814
Kopec, Julius L., 232-82-5952
Kopp, David L., 501-56-6746
Kottal, Douglas V., 524-72-6981
Kraemer, Eric A., 222-32-3484
Kramer, Robert C., 521-64-6302
Krehbiel, Carl C., 513-54-9247
Kreutz, Arthur R., Jr., 552-78-0825
Kruger, Mary C., 395-46-0471
Kruthers, Thomas V., 081-38-3764
Krynovich, Daniel G., 520-54-4193
Kubiak, Richard A., 107-40-9596
Kulik, Joseph S., 087-42-2886
Kurtz, Edward J., Jr., 428-98-4434
Kuster, Thomas J., Jr., 110-40-2023
Laack, William J., 216-50-2558
Lagerstrom, Eric J., 485-58-0304
Lainis, Thomas, Jr., 076-38-8134
Laliberte, Paul Q., 502-64-3715
Lamb, Arthur W., 560-70-7725
Lambert, Robert V., Jr., 406-70-2591
Lauer, Edward J., 534-42-3197
Lautermilch, Charles H., 155-38-5079
Lavigne, John O., 438-80-2993
Lawson, Bruce G., 043-42-2129
Lawson, William F., III, 487-54-2504
Leahy, James V., 063-40-9624
Leahy, Michael L., III, 463-80-5461
Leblanc, James M., 434-68-5158
Lee, David W., 520-52-6031
Lee, Frederick G., 426-92-1047
Legrow, Ralph W., 028-36-3687
Leininger, Carl J., 309-48-7241
Leja Stanley C., 398-46-3382
Lenaers, William M., 564-72-8865
Lenhart, Michael M., 432-86-9847
Lenicheck, Christopher A., 305-44-9554
Lennon, Bert L., 459-80-5010
Lennox, William J., Jr., 062-42-1093
Lesser, Harry K., Jr., 452-80-1068
Levandovsky, Richard G., 140-40-2246
Levister, Joseph W., Jr., 244-76-2051
Lewis, David R., 326-40-7793
Lewis, John C., 035-30-0780
Lewis, Mark R., 475-60-1154
Lewis, Stephen R., 262-96-8778
Ley, David J., 256-72-9786
Libershal, Charles E., 217-54-2637
Liebeck, Paul G., 054-38-4942
Lightfoot, Donna D., 432-94-3400
Lilygren, Evan, Jr., 269-40-4182
Lincoln, Jeffrey A., 097-40-6899
Lindekugel, Claude P., 505-56-3270
Lindsey, Norman H., 432-78-2993
Lindstrom, Clifford O., 340-42-7332
Linn, Michael T., 539-44-4566
Livingston, Raymond L., Jr., 259-66-8805
Livingston, Stephen C., 214-56-6474
Lohr, Stony R., 089-40-3496
Long, Clifford K., 512-48-5491
Long, Scott C., 226-64-8841
Long, William D., 533-52-2549
Longenecker, Vickie S., 514-52-2229
Longsworth, Ned V., Jr., 225-74-9472
Lorenz, Anthony L., 294-44-5821
Lovelady, Rex E., 459-84-9699
Lovell, James C., 217-52-4436
Lugenbill, Chris H., 163-42-4043
Lund, Kenneth W., 489-56-8801
Lundquist, David L., 522-70-2904
Lundy, Robert A., 512-50-8393
Lushbough, Ross E., 503-52-5899
Lyle, Gregory K., 178-38-2504
Lynch, Timothy R., 439-80-8618
Lynch, William L., Jr., 029-34-2341
MacGibbon, Evan C., 544-54-3459
Machamer, Thomas J., 216-56-9926
Mackey, John G., 560-66-4838
Macris, Jack, Jr., 587-32-9241
Madkins, Jerry B., 451-84-2063
Madsen, Ray E., 529-70-3557
Maestas, Alan H., 513-54-6284
Magee, Daniel A., 300-46-2781
Magowan, William J., Jr., 507-54-5298
Magyera, Stephen N., Jr., 131-38-4998
Maiello, Thomas C., Jr., 106-38-4664
Malone, Brian L., 012-40-7135
Malinowski, Paul A., 186-42-6005
Mandeville, John A., 254-76-7288
Maney, Rhoi M., 458-74-8387
Mansager, Bard K., 562-78-3575
Maples, Donald G., 285-42-2458
Maples, Michael D., 212-56-9508
Marion, George R., 157-36-5121
Marlin, David W., 227-68-1840
Marsh, Stephen J., 102-38-2231
Marshall, Francis M., 505-62-3883
Marshall, Johnny V., 362-48-6453
Marshall, William E., 575-58-8551
Marshman, Stephen J., 105-42-5273
Marshment, Kelvin C., 284-50-4169
Martin, Nelson N., 224-62-0640
Martin, Phillip M., 230-68-3095
Martin, Stephen E., 453-82-0467
Martinez, Jose M., 583-32-5568
Marty, Edward J., 420-60-2271
Mason, Anthony R., 509-48-8597
Mason, Timothy P., 521-62-5237
Massey, Richard A., 296-42-1202
Mathews, Thomas E., 366-52-2690
Mattfeld, William H., 470-56-6135
Matthews, Edward H., Jr., 240-82-1475
Matthews, James W., Jr., 418-62-9708
Matthews, John W., Jr., 431-86-7022
Matthews, Kenneth M., 404-70-0069

Matthews, Larry W., 498-50-0189
Matthews, Robert A., II, 452-70-5051
Matwiczak, Kenneth M., 554-74-3947
Maxon, David A., 564-78-7167
May, Terry T., 240-82-1937
Mayer, Phillip W., 445-38-5578
Mazur, Blanche E., 023-40-2778
McCall, Kenneth M., 506-64-4809
McCarter, Bobby C., 265-90-0985
McClellan, Chandler Y., 458-74-6946
McCormick, Arthur N., 138-34-9347
McCoy, Michael C., 520-56-7603
McCoy, Patrick M., 520-58-0384
McCreight, Richard D., 538-52-6042
McCrimmon, Robert E., 246-68-6605
McGee, Thomas W., Jr., 221-34-4206
McGuire, Michael L., 545-78-3662
McHenry, John R., 297-44-4255
McIntyre, David H., 454-92-8214
McKee, Claude J., 422-58-7918
McKenney, Richard F., 458-74-1273
McKenty, Bruce G., 215-46-7240
McLaughlin, Robert F., 072-42-2655
McMaughan, Patrick M., 356-34-6775
McMullen, Kieran E., 085-42-2516
McNally, Jeffrey A., 357-42-7288
McNamara, Thomas M., 036-32-4878
McNulty, Michael L., 388-48-0036
McPherson, William H., 239-82-0448
McQuistion, Brian E., 577-64-6695
McRae, John L., 416-64-6009
McWhinney, Tod H., 226-60-8022
Meeks, David L., 401-72-1484
Melcher, Max D., 449-82-9967
Menser, Michael W., 560-60-7638
Meredith, James E., 492-50-2540
Meredith, Kenneth C., 410-86-4573
Metcalf, Douglas H., 368-48-7155
Methered, James R., 575-58-9746
Mettala, Erik G., 367-50-8207
Michael, Terry R., 224-68-3283
Miksic, Terry L., 289-44-8685
Miller, David, 250-82-0923
Miller, John F., 073-38-8098
Miller, Joseph E., 485-56-1698
Miller, Kent D., Jr., 477-60-3518
Mills, Glenn M., 241-84-2636
Mills, Mark R., 516-56-8664
Milton, Theodore R., Jr., 231-70-2397
Minster, Daniel W., 331-42-0335
Minter, William H., Jr., 462-70-1214
Mirelson, Robert N., 262-96-3233
Mitchell, Robert E., 40[illegible]-62-2213
Mlynarski, John T., 091-42-1866
Modica, John P., 228-64-5981
Moglia, Ralph A., 460-80-5717
Molloy, Clyde P., 226-66-5353
Moman, Frankie L., 405-66-2600
Monastra, John R., 105-40-3941
Monore, Harry E., Jr., 236-74-8677
Monroe, James A., Jr., 239-88-2817
Moore, Charles D., 252-82-0520
Moore, James K., 462-78-8370
Moore, James R., Jr., 263-96-9494
Moore, Michael J., 188-40-4297
Moran, Joseph R., Jr., 536-46-5498
Morehead, Hubert L., 253-74-8575
Morehouse, Thomas F., II, 199-38-2003
Morgan, Emerson H., 136-40-2027
Morgan, William D., 429-92-0726
Morin, Dennis W., 549-68-6368
Morin, Stephen J., 004-50-4736
Morris, Andrew N., 522-68-7262
Morris, Daniel T., 225-66-5851
Morrison, Terry L., 563-64-1176
Mortensen, Lee K., 518-58-0256
Moses, Steven L., 412-82-5800
Moss, Terry R., 263-04-2427
Motley, Campbell M., 251-76-8848
Moudy, James D., 519-52-5150
Moulton, Robert B., Jr., 409-84-1749
Mudder, Gary D., 504-50-1672
Mukai, Thomas V., 137-42-2755
Mulhern, Richard A., 050-42-9912
Muniz, Victor., 463-74-3986
Murfin, Robert R., 316-48-0343
Murphy, Daniel D., 107-38-4610
Nakayama, Adrian R., 030-38-1310
Nash, John A., 397-48-7328
Nason, Noah., III, 014-40-5904
Nazar, Stephen., 056-40-1353
Nelsen, John T., II, 395-54-6321
Nelson, James P., 503-56-1281
Nelson, Paul H., 391-46-6106
Nelson, Terrance E., 501-50-3314
Nelsonpalmer, Michael K., 513-44-2034
Nichols, William E., 576-56-1115
Nickels, Dennis E., 526-70-3291
Nickoli, Gregg R., 399-50-1091
Nicks, Edward L., Jr., 251-86-2544
Nida, Ross D., 498-50-4667
Nieder, Alvin E., 452-88-9584
Niederman, Mark B., 553-80-2089
Nilon, John H., 457-82-3413
Nix, Billy, 436-70-2613
Noe, John W., Jr., 299-44-7700
Norton, George D., 560-80-4497
Norvell, Lee A., 227-74-5370
Nowak, Thomas S., 111-40-8524
Nusbaum, Charles M., 259-78-1856
Oberthaler, David P., 374-48-3939
O'Brien, James M., 274-48-8877
Ogilvy, Thomas W., 225-72-5829
Oglesby, Forrest E., Jr., 230-70-2934
Ogren, John W., 215-46-1012
Ohlstein, Allen, 141-40-4479
Ohnmeis, Harold A., 047-42-2253
O'Keefe, Robert M., 052-38-6567
Oldham, Robert W., 579-64-9065
Oler, Roy P., 457-74-2573
Oliver, Randall G., 490-54-0786
Olson, Donald C., 531-52-7892
Olson, Joseph L., 249-70-9729
Osborne, Charles T., 506-64-6936
Ottley, David L., 529-60-7023
Ouellette, Ronald E., 002-38-8258
Owen, Peter W., 217-52-7142
Owens, Marion G., 430-92-6447
Ozbolt, Bernard R., 247-80-4576
Ozolek, David J., 273-44-7850
Pace, James M., 529-76-7242
Packer, Jackie C., 263-80-6034
Padgett, James A., 265-80-3533
Panning, Glen A., 507-66-7206
Parker, Daniel D., 464-66-1605
Parker, Dean R., 465-74-2022
Parker, Joe R., 413-80-2092
Parker, Robert F., Jr., 222-36-2917
Parker, Ronald M., 484-60-3435
Parker, William P., 362-56-5035
Parkin, David P., 453-82-0053
Parnell, Rondle B., 432-98-6415
Parrack, Cecil T., Jr., 52[illegible]-54-6649
Parsons, Boyd D., Jr., 250-92-0375
Parvin, Gary F., 432-80-7981
Paskowski, Michael E., Jr., 031-38-9866
Patrick, Robert W., 229-58-3222
Patterson, Ollie E., Jr., 432-88-0008
Patton, David L., 226-62-1954
Paulino, Benny M., 586-03-5606
Pawlicki, Raymond, 290-48-1760
Pegg, John D., 518-60-2544
Penhallegon, William M., 537-50-5433
Perezpoveda, Gustavo G., 053-36-3156
Perry, Dennis W., 285-46-3372
Perry, Donald H., 414-76-4907
Perry, John H., Jr., 259-80-2272
Perry, Robert S., 551-74-1194
Perry, Susan P., 329-42-3[illegible]32
Persechini, Fortunato, 019-38-4783
Peterson, Andrew M., 548-80-8412
Petterson, Maurice E., 517-54-9250
Phillips, David L., 345-38-1903
Phillips, Dwight E., 285-44-5044
Pientka, Joe Jr., 226-60-1796
Pikula, Michael, 048-44-9908
Pilipick, Robert G., 384-48-1978
Pingley, Randall L., 233-74-9707
Pinkerton, Paul V., 587-07-6345
Plummer, McDonald Jr., 419-64-7583
Pogue, Edward W., 441-48-0802
Pohler, Michael S., 227-66-0933
Pond, Paul M., 453-76-4025
Postell, Edward D., 165-42-9282
Powell, William W., 430-84-4762
Powers, James F., Jr., 420-62-1185
Prasil, Colleen F., 556-68-3365
Prewitt, Sherrod N., 461-76-5[illegible]2
Price, Morris E., Jr., 452-78-0435
Pride, Samuel G., 314-48-0591
Prior, Douglas C., 056-38-0768
Provinsal, John A., 539-50-5906
Psaila, George W., 257-68-2328
Pualoa, James K., 576-54-1345
Pucci, Paul J., 561-82-0721
Pue, Veronika G., 533-54-0802
Purtymun, John G., 258-76-0827
Quimby, David R., 033-38-9931
Radke, John W., 502-58-0677
Ramos, Thomas F., 088-40-1018
Randolph, Stephen C., 573-76-9213
Rasmussen, Raymond E., II, 415-84-7044
Ratzel, Stephen R., 406-70-3208
Rawlings, Thomas C., 218-42-7356
Reardon, Joseph D., 053-38-2613
Rees, Chester L., Jr., 4[illegible]3-76-0952
Reger, David R., 574-18-2979
Reicherfer, Ronald R., 178-40-3230
Reid, John A., 231-68-8907
Reimers, Ronald, 519-50-3072
Reininger, Reid A., 457-76-9426
Reinsprecht, Josef, 136-38-8751
Reischl, Timothy J., 548-68-4900
Renaud, William E., 226-62-7851
Rendleman, Michael E., 407-62-3136
Revell, Joseph L., 318-40-1344
Revie, Andrew I., 255-74-2134
Rhodes, Jonathan F., 217-52-9599
Rhyne, David W., 230-70-3642
Rials, Lee A., 404-68-2399
Rice, James A., 565-72-1924
Rice, James E., III, 228-68-9037
Rice, Ronald L., 441-46-3300
Rice, Stephen D., 215-50-6403
Richardson, Donald W., 247-72-9382
Rieger, Bernd K., 180-38-8023
Riggs, Jerry W., 464-68-2094
Rindler, James P., 273-46-2300
Rini, Thomas J., 436-76-6035
Ripperger, Clifton A., III, 266-96-4530
Ritchie, Michael G., 046-42-8757
Ritter, George P., 361-40-2462
Rivette, Patrick D., 258-74-9707
Roberts, Douglas, 545-80-7674
Roberts, Frederick A., 417-64-9590
Roberts, John T., 291-48-7965
Roberts, Karen S., 405-60-2871
Robinson, David A., 466-76-0159
Robinson, Hayward, 421-60-8337
Robinson, Michal R., 530-38-1267
Roche, Richard B., Jr., 563-60-5676
Rock, Alan J., 182-40-6109
Rockwell, Christopher A., 100-40-5319
Rodgers, Stephen L., 571-80-6469
Roehl, Kenn A., 502-56-0462
Rogers, Thomas C., 529-54-2415
Rolio, Richard L., 505-58-6898
Roman, Stephen P., 206-38-3123
Root, Peter B., 489-50-9963
Rose, Kenneth H., 397-48-9476
Ross, Richard 441-48-1634
Ross, Robert J., 261-92-5364
Rossi, John J., 147-42-8632
Roudabush, William D., 183-40-2250
Rowan, John W., 156-42-0601
Rowlette, Ronald L., 410-78-2877
Roy, Steven E., 416-64-8966
Rozman, Joseph T., Jr., 266-92-4031
Rudman, John F., 148-44-7955
Rulison, Ronald A., 445-48-9927
Runals, Stephen E., 113-42-9179
Runte, August 110-36-0644
Russ, Jerome F., 522-62-9575
Russell, Jeffrey W., 024-36-4163
Russo, Christopher S., 462-74-9168
Russo, John G., 102-40-3761
Ryan, Michael C., 418-68-7695
Ryan, Michael P., 312-54-9787
Ryan, Willaim A., 320-42-5313
Sabata, William T., 521-70-6013
Sabine, George P., V, 095-38-8611
Sahlin, Carl T., Jr., 011-40-1969
Salice, Henry J., Jr., 010-42-2883

Sandberg, Michael L., 080-38-5491
Santiago, Juan G., 580-94-1700
Sasser, Roland E., Jr., 256-68-4057
Sassi, Raffaele A., 455-80-8868
Savage, Jay R., 529-68-3616
Savage, Michael W., 282-46-9814
Savage, Robert E., 526-66-5210
Sawyers, William T., 234-78-1291
Scatamacchia, Vincent 066-42-6442
Scearce, Roger W., 096-38-1156
Scherberger, Richard J., 231-58-6600
Scheuer, Henry H., 430-88-6228
Schexnayder, Michael C., 438-70-4229
Schiffner, Frederick W., 507-62-8671
Schlesinger, James S., 440-52-1898
Schlund, Bradley D., 524-70-1726
Schmader, John R., 172-40-1780
Schmitt, John K., 117-40-8391
Schmus, Donald J., 100-36-6704
Schnabel, Andrew G., 284-48-4517
Schott, William L., 441-50-0918
Schrader, Henry C., Jr., 224-72-0457
Schultheiss, John J., Jr., 204-40-4903
Schumacher, Roger D., 540-56-6309
Schwegler, Bartley R., Jr., 430-92-8512
Sciba, Dennis C., 564-74-1431
Scott, Craig O., 219-50-4849
Scott, Harry A., 409-78-0771
Scott, James T., 502-54-3138
Scroggins, Coy R., 544-50-9867
Scruton, William M., 227-70-8124
Scully, Matthew L., Jr., 162-40-9134
Scupien, Joseph D., 103-36-7861
Seay, Stephen M., 213-50-2151
Seeger, Garold E., 509-56-9218
Seibert, Gary D., 307-48-0932
Seim, Richard R., 556-72-5677
Seiter, Eugene D., Jr., 251-84-8202
Seletsky, Joseph P., 222-32-2372
Self, Robert R., 430-82-7273
Selin, George T., 267-74-2626
Serene, Fred L., Jr., 456-80-0510
Sergio, Stephen T., 018-38-0779
Serna, Robert W., 467-84-0258
Shaffer, Robert L., 467-80-1440
Shaw, Charles C., 547-54-3994
Shaw, Claude D., 257-70-9729
Shaw, Gary L., 471-56-5258
Shaw, Michael D., 228-64-8470
Shaw, Rayford L., 451-90-9226
Sheehan, Morris F., 242-70-1190
Shepard, Aubrey D., Jr., 461-82-8349
Shields, Robert G., 076-40-5256
Shively, Robert G., 551-76-1130
Shoup, William L., 194-42-1411
Showers, Walter M., 587-05-1666
Siegert, Stephen R., 178-40-0009
Simmons, Joseph J., V, 218-52-7078
Simmons, Randall O., 194-40-8498
Simmons, Rickey C., 429-98-0064
Simonsen, Peter C., 528-72-0310
Simpson, Royce L., 500-54-4968
Sims, Ronald C., 257-70-8421
Sisson, James R., 406-66-0637
Sjue, Christopher S., 501-52-0900
Skeele, Joseph F., 268-46-1632
Slattery, Patrick J., 051-38-6045
Smith, Brent T., 445-48-4926
Smith, Bruce L., 526-76-6225
Smith, Charles O., 462-74-0783
Smith, Douglas R., 488-62-5157
Smith, Gary A., 183-40-6289
Smith, George W., Jr., 576-50-8923
Smith, Joe C., 245-76-9423
Smith, Judge C., 587-26-8512
Smith, Laurence J., 241-84-5325
Smith, Paul H., 264-88-0997
Smith, Thomas E., 008-36-5807
Smith, William M., 227-66-6825
Smyth, David T., 576-54-7999
Snapp, Patrick G., 536-52-0614
Soo, Houng Y., 102-40-9072
Southerland, Norman K., 432-88-0753
Spara, Jeffrey L., 099-40-1957
Speicher, Lana K., 523-64-9743
Spitler, Mark G., 315-52-7430
Spohn, Edward A., III, 274-48-2152
Spurlin, Lynn V., 253-80-8839
Squires, Steven D., 509-48-6347
Stacha, Raimund, 456-82-1895
Stahl, Terry M., 224-62-5850
Stallings, Richard H., 153-40-7191
Starr, Michael T., 398-52-8136
Starry, Michael D., 210-40-2707
St. Clair, Stephen F., 282-44-0443
Stecher, Thomas A., 294-48-1058
Steele, Danton G., II, 487-54-4425
Steele, William A., III, 430-92-2903
Stein, Alan L., 526-80-0180
Steklasa, Dorene J., 472-48-9590
Stenstrom, James M., 440-52-1451
Stephens, L. D., 532-38-4547
Stevenson, John G., 212-56-0884
Stevick, Ruth A., 363-44-3149
Stewart, Charles W., Jr., 257-70-9994
Stewart, Phillip R., 419-62-9503
Stewart, Ronald L., 223-66-3470
Stokley, Richard R., 120-36-3278
Stokoe, James H., 516-62-6021
Stoll, Larry E., 506-58-5195
Stolze, Patrick C., 345-40-1075
Stone, James W., 450-78-9695
Stramm, William R., 260-78-9650
Strasser, Herbert D., 485-66-3937
Stratton, Christopher D., 562-86-0195
Streeter, Douglas L., 371-50-6058
Strock, Carl A., 224-70-1502
Studnicka, Donald F., 508-64-5994
Suchland, Jack E., 535-46-6979
Suermann, Thomas C., 143-38-7319
Sundin, Eric M., 247-92-6850
Suzuki, William J., 214-58-9638
Swannack, Charles H. Jr., 237-82-8239
Sweat, Lawrence R., 309-54-2064
Szczepanski, John C., 192-36-5441
Szymurski, Steven R., 434-74-2317
Taddonio, Frank T., 116-40-5585
Tahtinen, Daniel A., 365-46-8579
Tanigawa, Michael F., 576-56-3805
Tant, Hugh B., III, 247-80-4312
Tarbox, David G., 075-38-2447
Tarr, Ronald W., 266-86-0059
Taylor, Warren M., 322-42-3415
Taylor, William L., 428-70-8616
Teesdale, Thomas J., 204-38-1158
Tehero, Demetrio J., 576-50-5049
Tekell, Robert S., 467-76-8354
Terrill, William L., Jr., 395-46-9037
Terry, Bennie L., 231-66-0925
Tessier, Lawrence A., 572-66-4153
Tetu, William J., 391-50-0010
Theaux, Thomas N., 438-68-7616
Thom, Brian L., 026-38-0299
Thomas, Charles G., 569-76-0058
Thomas, David G., 507-56-0821
Thomas, Ronald D., 433-74-0151
Thompson, Jonathan S., 465-82-4980
Thompson, Richard B., 502-52-8100
Thomson, Peter W., 019-40-4101
Tice, Edward M., 517-52-1788
Tiderman, Michael C., 526-80-6544
Tierney, Thomas F., 454-86-2212
Tillery, Herbert R., 237-74-6617
Timar, Joseph J., 559-54-9725
Tindall, Thomas O., Jr., 128-38-4919
Tobin, Daniel J., 560-76-9530
Tobin, William F., 034-32-9261
Toler, Garvis W., Jr., 223-68-0648
Tolle, Steven A., 107-38-5078
Tomita, Russell M., 576-56-8754
Tone, Brian P., 105-40-5978
Toone, Steven B., 462-78-3856
Touchet, Neil H., 266-80-6624
Townsend, William C., 237-80-4425
Tozzi, Gerard, 261-86-2730
Trabue, William C., 083-38-2098
Treyz, Fred A., III, 219-50-2369
Troutman, Keith G., 183-38-9867
Tsuneta, Jerrold Y., 548-72-8791
Turpin, Terry S., 492-52-5412
Uselton, Billy D., 410-84-0336
Vanbuskirk, James H., Jr., 349-38-4348
Vanbuskirk, Raymond M., 517-52-5854
Vanderlaan, John C., 527-92-5101
Vanexel, John F., 124-38-4749
Vanwinkle, Hans A., 070-40-8718
Vaughn, Stephen D., 461-86-6364
Verbanick, John J., 183-36-3964
Vickrey, James D., 238-72-9792
Victorson, Mark E., 350-38-9087
Vines, John R., 416-64-5345
Vining, Raymond P., Jr., 431-90-6547
Virgil, Greg A., 212-54-7689
Vogel, William L., 156-36-9065
Vrazel, Gary J., 421-66-5391
Wade, Raymond F., Jr., 104-42-7200
Wagner, Philip R., 181-40-1252
Wake, Carl K., 262-74-3650
Walker Doak H., 457-82-5500
Walker, Richard L., 548-84-5969
Walker, Walton H., II, 027-40-4691
Wall, Hubert B., Jr., 418-60-2063
Wallace, Michael C., 245-80-3543
Wallace, Thomas R., 455-74-4226
Wallen, David A., 461-82-2345
Walsh, Walter V., Jr., 001-34-9146
Walter, George R., Jr., 432-96-6250
Walter, James A., 295-46-8676
Wank, James A., 382-50-9290
Ward, William E., 216-52-9000
Ward, William E., 519-50-9159
Warnement, Jerry J., 294-42-3666
Washington, James M., 231-60-6246
Waterman, Lloyd T., 391-48-2903
Watford, Raymond E., Jr., 170-38-6245
Watkins, Howard E., 184-38-0739
Watkins, James J., 280-42-4563
Watson, Ramon K., 587-03-8192
Watson, Tadashi M., 228-72-3259
Watson, Thomas R., Jr. 511-48-7042
Watts, Thomas P., 428-98-5080
Weaver, William C., 245-76-5359
Webb, Duane E., 527-58-3666
Weems, Dewey L., 408-80-5081
Wehrman, Mary R., 408-86-0694
Weidner, Glenn R., 509-56-7139
Weinstock, Jeffrey B., 213-50-3012
Welch, John O., 106-38-4288
Wells, Burnie D., 466-72-0368
Wells, Oscar T., III., 463-72-8820
Wells, Wayne C., 251-78-6324
Wenick, Louis M., 201-40-1145
Wentreek, Roy C., 449-86-5891
Wenzloff, Gregory R., 375-50-0893
Werle, Christopher P., 223-72-1749
Westrip, Charles W., 296-40-2426
Whitcomb, Roy S., 266-74-7058
White, Phillip O., 408-82-3747
White, Stephen J., 540-58-2732
Widboom, Jon G, 474-58-5934
Wilcox, Stephen F., 519-54-5572
Wilcox, Timothy J., 061-42-6031
Wilkerson, Glenn D., 423-66-8724
Williams, Charles H., Jr., 158-40-1343
Williams, Charles M., 441-54-7080
Williams, Christopher T., 231-52-5227
Williams, Emmet F., 258-76-5073
Williams, Hilary M., III., 449-82-4227
Williams, James A., 514-54-3442
Williams, Karl B., 074-42-5405
Williams, Randall C., Jr., 206-38-1085
Williams, Robert C., 174-40-4269
Williams, Rodney L., 530-30-0397
Williamson, Dennis A., 406-68-3549
Williamson, Gary N., 405-72-7764
Williamson, Norman L., 426-86-6504
Wilson, Edward R., 199-36-2707
Wilson, Fred R., 018-38-9569
Wilson, Jerre W., 420-62-6490
Wilson, Ronald W., 282-44-1302
Wilson, Theodore C., 466-84-3904
Wilson, Warren D., 520-54-4764
Winkelman, Colin K., 485-62-7398
Winslow, Richard L., 006-48-6267
Wismann, Joseph B., 406-72-1319
Witherel, Jeffrey A., 191-40-0499
Wixted, Michael G., 571-76-6429
Wong, Chadwick W., 575-52-7881
Wonsik, John M., Jr., 463-72-1290
Woodward, Robert L., 492-54-9281
Wooten, Richard E., 251-96-1546
Worsham, Lushene M., 467-68-2546
Woythal, Jeffrey P., 393-44-3206

Wright, Gary W., 413-82-2598
Wright, James E., 308-48-4738
Wright, Steven J., 320-44-8022
Wright, Walter J., 160-40-5660
Wyatt, Lee T., III, 428-98-9981
Wyman, Francis L., 213-50-6773
Wynn, Donald T., 546-76-8540
Yakovac, Joseph L., 189-42-1273
Yarrow, William M., 090-40-8653
Yaws, Neil S., 454-78-9106
Yesensky, Richard J., 546-74-0905
Yost, Dennis E., 292-44-1217
Young, Alan R., 571-80-9770
Young, Daniel E., 453-92-6525
Young, James D., 548-74-6442
Youngblood, Richard A., 585-44-5548
Yrazabal, Mark A., 518-54-6109
Zaremski, Walter F., 197-36-3427
Zelazny, Robert C., 535-46-9216
Zimmerman, Richard E., 190-40-4515

CHAPLAINS CORPS

To be major

Brinsfield, John W., Jr., 258-66-0191
Camp, Charles D., 450-62-7669
Hanchett, Donald G., 546-68-4021
Hicks, David H., 080-32-1012
Joshua, Stephen, 149-56-3235
Midgette, Bobby G., 245-60-9826
Morrison, John W., Jr., 227-48-2863
Pike, Charles W., 246-58-3864
Powers, Thomas J., 287-48-8468
Staab, J. T., 334-30-5968

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be major

Allemeier, Daniel R., 536-48-1522
Anderson, Paul B., Jr., 422-62-1012
Brooks, Waldo W., III, 227-74-3473
Brunson, Frank G., Jr., 558-70-1086
Bryant, Thomas L., 426-98-3106
Buckey, Kerry A., 211-40-1933
Byrd, Wilbert, 291-40-1107
Carlton, Roy D., 131-38-4489
Cunningham, Clarence E., 412-80-3152
Dale, Buris C., Jr., 457-88-7690
Dellorto, Daniel J., 089-42-8302
Fano, Robert M., 448-44-7271
Finnegan, Patrick, 524-74-1878
Flanagan, Kevin, 524-68-2655
Fligg, Warren P., 547-78-2303
Hahn, Alan K., 395-46-4872
Hemingway, Charles W., 431-82-8860
Hodges, Keith H., 550-78-0650
Johnston, Paul L., 331-40-7637
Jones, Dwight F., 227-72-4811
Kinder, Larry E., 486-52-8204
King, Ward D., Jr., 459-82-8265
LeClair, Thomas J., 249-82-7107
Lower, Philip E., 215-52-7095
Lujan, Thomas R., 470-58-8285
Martin, Robert W., 41-90-5705
Martin, Thomas G., 421-66-1856
McKay, Bernard J., 325-38-5901
Mogabgab, Stephen A., 438-76-6486
Moye, Danny R., 232-76-9517
Mura, Steven J., 539-46-3003
Murrell, James O., 304-48-7473
Odowd, John H., Jr., 248-88-9672
Parker, Randall A., 466-80-9761
Parsons, Gregory L., 478-54-5491
Patrick, Jackie B., 444-48-4735
Pyrz, Thomas A., 352-40-3033
Raymond, William D., Jr., 561-72-2762
Ross, Joseph E., 101-40-7587
Rothlein, Julius, 148-42-6065
Russell, James S., 007-42-6357
Schwarz, Paul W., 566-80-4456
Serene, Jan W., 456-80-1700
Stamand, Gerard A., 013-40-2594
Steinbeck, Mark A., 263-78-6781
Thomason, Terry E., 290-48-6869
Wall, Michael J., 246-62-1669
Wamsted, Michael L., 527-70-5595
Young, John P., 457-78-0770

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be major

Aron, Bruce L., 001-34-9276
Augsburger, Russell J., 215-38-2669
Bailey, Stephen M., Jr., 459-72-0240
Baker, Stuart W., 113-38-4449
Ball, Michael B., 304-52-1231
Barszcz, Michael E., 217-48-6636
Baumann, Ronald C., 326-40-3339
Blum, George J., 547-82-0960
Bock, Frederick M., 104-34-7876
Boujai, Carlton J., Jr., 136-38-2101
Burton, Lloyd R., 506-56-7264
Chaffee, Dennis L., 195-38-5339
Cothran, Thomas L., 248-78-5351
Davis, Ford R., 450-84-8931
Driggers, William D., 261-68-7104
Dukes, Michael W., 534-50-9847
Durkan, John P., Jr., 028-38-0521
Egnon, Gary W., 324-38-4645
Evenden, James J., 518-56-8367
Farris, Charles R., 444-46-5743
Fisher, Martin J., 144-40-2992
Foley, Brian P., 057-40-6696
Gardner, Joseph E., III, 576-50-1130
Grassia, Philip G., 146-36-4497
Heckert, Robert J., Jr., 255-84-4995
Heinemann, Warren F., 531-52-7806
Hilts, Barry W., 547-66-4859
Hoch, Alfred L., 448-46-8853
Horne, Rodney D., 228-68-5316
Indrisano, Gerard S., 021-36-2139
Jackson, Jerome L., 212-52-3259
Johnson, William B., 485-52-6427
Leisher, Kenneth W., 022-34-2829
Levens, Jack L., 463-78-5355
Little, James S., 209-38-5953
Loader, Michael B., 457-88-7640
Madeo, Peter D., 228-66-8702
Maher, Patrick H., 585-28-2902
Martinez, Phillip T., 527-84-3786
Mayes, Tommy W., 458, 78-9942
McCormick, Roscoe, 241-78-6614
McMichael, Lee N., 156-38-1568
Mervis, Stuart A., 267-96-7513
Milhous, Wilbur K., 249-82-1400
Moran, Errol L., 439-70-9251
Novier, Frank H., 461-88-5106
Olson, Calvin J., 529-60-3864
Opio, Roger M., 439-70-3417
Patterson, James O., III, 251-78-7663
Phillips, Edward P., Jr., 218-50-0837
Pigford, Joe N., 240-76-8526
Piper, Llewellyn E., 250-86-3859
Potyk, Roger P., 150-32-5557
Poux, Robert J., Jr., 177-38-8232
Reaves, James R., Jr., 422-54-2106
Richter, Paul V., 418-62-8459
Rose, Charles A., 536-56-0028
Schulenburg, Robert J., 313-42-4839
Sebastian, Henry A., 454-82-5185
Sikora, Robert G., 322-40-9199
Smith, Lee T., 463-76-9738
Stinson, Karl R., 535-50-4820
Stone, Steven J., 429-90-6050
Swenson, Gerald B., 032-34-6847
Threet, Allan R., 006-50-4677
Turner, Gilbert F., 223-66-1887
Ursone, Richard L., 047-44-5290
Vervack, Larry P., 444-48-0824
Wakefield, Walter W., II, 548-74-0897
Walker, Johnny M., 449-76-6728
Watson, Charles V., 182-38-8809
Wenk, John D., 265-86-3285
Wolfe, Michael W., 259-74-5488
Zimmer, Bolko G., 277-44-5616
Zurcher, John W., 564-72-6152

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

Bong, Mary E., 503-54-52[illegible]
Brandenburg, Joe W., 402-72-8483
Daigle, Wade W., 434-62-8958
Fullerton, Jack S., Jr., 544-58-0225
Krause, Patricia A., 539-34-9653
Nemmers, Thereas M., 503-58-5504
Phelan, Janice A., 329-40-2038
Rousey, James L., Jr., 404-64-6062
Watson, Monte R., 524-64-8195

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

Baze, Wallace B., 460-80-9122
Dutton, Ronald E., 471-56-5379
Holt, Mack A., 254-72-8329
Trotter, Ronald W., 503-64-2699

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

Bell, Karen A., 186-42-0511
Berry, George E., 163-38-0874
Boyle, Kim A., 503-54-4622
Boyle, Virginia A., 089-42-2076
Brink, Dorothy A., 195-40-7640
Brooks, Raymond R., 448-42-5325
Brown, Janet R., 228-60-6845
Brumett, Joan H., 116-32-0074
Buczynski, Ronald J., 380-44-2006
Burgess, Molly C., 024-42-8774
Campbell, Kathleen M. 351-44-0216
Cannon, Cheryl A., 565-72-1664
Carter, Linda B., 264-88-4065
Clayton, Mary B., 585-42-4115
Cochran, Maureen C., 059-42-6888
Corley, Ellen C., 250-92-0722
Cox, Archie R., 426-72-0696
DeMarais, Alice L., 096-40-1548
Ferrell, James C., 452-78-0248
Fletcher, Linda L., 452-84-1538
Foerster, Kristin S., 267-82-0109
Foss, Susan E., 333-44-3774
Frank, Robert L., 078-40-6434
Fuller, Patricia S., 585-16-1913
Galante, Christine M., 577-68-3872
Gray, Ollie B., 198-42-2121
Grodizicki, Barbara A., 240-84-4867
Gurney, Cynthia A., 354-46-6744
Hahn, Timothy H., 162-42-3832
Harrison, John M., 082-34-4148
Heger, Mary J., 197-40-1275
Hentges, George P., 484-58-0218
Hilliard, James R., 156-84-7740
Hix, Gary D., 193-40-3531
Hoge, Linda J., 526-78-4313
Humphrey, Janet E., 175-40-8139
Hunt, Barbara J., 390-56-9944
Hutchison, Janet M., 533-50-3809
Jackson, Brendel J., 039-32-7134
Jeleski, Barbara A., 448-52-3034
Jung, Walter J., Jr., 149-42-8774
Kading, Steven E., 504-58-8301
Liebner, Carol A., 267-88-8312
Lopezrosario, Julio 584-05-7191
Marfell, Kaye L., 503-62-2838
McClelland, Gail K., 282-50-3074
McClenney, Lucretia M., 401-74-6242
McCormack, Claire M., 156-44-4921
McFarland, Barbara T., 298-12-1686
McNeil, Marian R., 338-42-2218
Meadows, Richard F., 439-62-6992
Millard, Barbara J., 504-54-4351
Moore, Christine S., 003-40-0276
Moye, Margaret M., 496-52-6686
Norton, Margaret M., 181-40-6494
O'Donnell, Jayne P., 039-30-9542
Owens, Patricia O., 225-72-5503
Pourpasand, Linda S., 469-62-5324
Pugh, Linda M., 543-62-4612
Reams, Robert R., 552-58-3359
Reineck, Carol L., 518-64-2209
Robertshaw, Linda A., 519-60-3395
Ryba, Jeanie R., 442-50-5976
Sadler, Freida J., 438-78-8771
Schlesinger, Frances B., 355-44-8996
Schoch, Janet M., 265-08-6798
Schommer, Patricia A., 502-58-4479
Smith, Michael C., 507-56-5762
Sparks, Glenn E., Jr., 259-70-0273
Srsicstoehr, Kathleen M., 197-40-3078
Talusan, Edgardo C., 101-48-0308
Tiernan, Helen S., 052-42-9623
Tijerina, Maria D., Rosario., 463-72-1914
Titcomb, Linda K., 282-50-7263
Torgerson, Kimron R., 516-56-0121
Vanostrand, Susan K., 226-76-0421
Weyhrich, Donald R., 346-40-1619
Wozny, Terree L., 517-56-8413
Yaws, Jane A., 354-46-7561
Yeo, Ann P., 224-70-8074

The following-named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S Army, and appointment in the Regular Army, in accordance with section 602, Title VI. Transition Provisions, Defense Officer Personnel Management Act of 1980 and the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 531, 532, 533. Dates of rank will be determined by the Secretary of the Army.

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be major

Allen, Richard B., 422-66-7254
Allison, Oscar Jr., 249-84-1028
Almborg, John A., 070-38-6852
Andrews, Gregory, 405-63-0399
Andrews, Jeffry M., 231-68-9263
Angelle, Alexander, 272-44-9955
Aplin, Thomas L., 460-76-7699
Ariff, Louis P., 221-28-2829
Armstrong, Council J., Jr., 218-40-8231
Askew, Robert T., 264-92-9591
Aus, Gary L., 569-74-3006
Auten, Chesley D., 457-60-9862
Ayers, Martin J., 264-86-9664
Aymar, Edward O., 530-36-0820
Baldridge, Donald K., 487-54-9904
Baldwin, Russell P., 379-48-7699
Barber, Jefferson W., 574-20-2013
Barbour, Jerome A., Jr., 169-36-5855
Barker, Jack W., 515-42-6782
Barker, Robert T., Jr., 460-66-8832
Barnes, Carl B., Jr., 224-72-0488
Barnett, Lavonne 420-64-1336
Barnett, Stephen F., 224-64-0263
Barrett, Harold S., 259-70-5556
Bartosch, Peter M., 121-42-0718
Bass, Rand M., 552-66-2284
Batson, Douglas B., 261-76-3181
Bean, Robert H., II, 568-58-0865
Bean, William W., 498-38-7327
Belanus, Terrance B., 502-62-0615
Bell, Bruce K., 204-38-0104
Bell, Keith W., 561-76-4104
Bennett, James C., Jr., 425-98-7125
Beraud, Jeanmichel A., 465-82-1990
Berg, Cleland C., 504-56-4515
Bernard, Robert D., 429-80-0103
Bernhard, Vincent A., 176-40-9048
Beyer, Vincent G., 503-58-9987
Bezy, John H., III, 444-48-0165
Biechler, Dwight A., 268-46-7797
Birchall, Dennis R., 531-50-8228
Bishop, Harold W., 527-64-2522
Bishop, James M., Sr., 250-66-6468
Black, Alan C., 180-36-6706
Black, Harold W., 460-70-1320
Blackmon, Waddy J., 248-74-2304
Blackwell, Edward T., 214-48-6441
Blazek, Patrick W., 483-68-0020
Bledsoe, William T., 231-58-0324
Bodenner, Ralph K., III, 356-36-3887
Bohannon, Michael A., 416-62-7945
Bohman, Robert K., 044-36-6269
Bolden, Dennis H., 226-66-7171
Booze, David R., 504-58-6539
Bouwense, Rex R., 336-38-0844
Bowers, Robert L., 467-84-0519
Bowling, George L., 228-62-7135
Bowman, Matthew R., 249-74-4771
Boyd, Thomas M., 412-66-4619
Boykin, Jesse L., III, 546-76-9435
Boyles, David F., 554-70-6977
Brannon, Johnny L., 413-84-8533
Brennan, John L., 037-30-0986
Brewington, Darrell E., 574-12-3135
Brookins, Edgar A., Jr., 587-03-6566
Brooks, Lenior L., 249-84-0992
Broussard, Roy A., 433-70-4351
Brown, Marion J., Jr., 459-74-3413
Bruno, Thomas A., 554-80-3172
Bryan, Joseph M., 266-60-9134
Bunker, David E., 394-48-5330
Burcham, Shadric T., 542-54-1714
Burdick, James R., Jr., 509-46-7555
Burks, Richard A., 152-34-5197
Burlingame, David B., 037-32-1542
Burnette, Spencer M., Jr., 085-40-8323
Burrell, Edward H., 029-36-2294
Burroughs, Edgar S., III, 253-74-7313
Burton, Wayne T., 249-84-7192
Bushey, Keith R., 157-38-3873
Bushover, Gary E., 459-78-9195
Butz, Thomas R., 301-46-0667
Byther, Douglas B., 265-92-2589
Cagle, Randal S., 420-64-9480
Cain, Eddie, 587-18-1695
Campbell, Emory G., 458-78-0106
Campbell, Gary V., 429-88-2043
Capps, William T., Jr., 243-78-6949
Carey, Howard J., 081-38-9797
Carpenter, Peter J., 015-42-9536
Carter Edward J., 536-42-1485
Carter James B., 543-50-1321
Carter Joseph O., Jr., 587-03-2268
Carter, Ronald V., 243-74-0368
Cavanaugh, Francis P., Jr., 185-36-6398
Chamberlin, Gary N., 002-36-9483
Chambers, James D., 505-66-4609
Chandler, Alan R., 306-54-6772
Chapin, Lewis J., 514-50-6411
Chatterton, John C., 533-42-5578
Childs, Alan S., 509-46-4037
Christensen, Gary L., 568-60-9364
Christensen, Robert S., Jr., 223-70-1036
Clarke, Marshall E., Jr., 226-62-2444
Clarkson, James W., 251-72-9732
Clayton, Michael S., 487-54-7420
Clement, Edward J., III, 263-84-5806
Coatney, Terry W., 190-40-7281
Cocchia, Peter A., 048-42-7403
Coe, Augustus V., 522-64-4018
Coffman, Jerry P., 314-46-8114
Cole, Christopher L., 279-42-2265
Cole, Richard B., 379-46-8697
Coleman, Jonathan M., 260-72-6241
Coleman, William R., 410-80-5654
Collins Larry J., 453-76-4142
Colter, Alan R., 445-42-8115
Compisi, John A., 090-40-1542
Cook, Steven E., 414-78-4106
Cooley, Michael L., 120-36-2922
Cooper, William R., 416-64-9782
Cordes, Steven C., 044-34-2753
Corley, Larry W., 437-80-1736
Cornelius, Jeffrey V., 225-72-1466
Cortes, Carl A., 071-36-7661
Costa, Jerome A., Jr., 407-62-9090
Cox, Thomas J., 498-44-7308
Cranz, Donald, 041-38-1548
Creegan, Rochelle I., 536-38-3484
Crockett, Lawrence C., Jr., 055-40-7905
Croley, Walter D., 520-50-4602
Crossan, William R., II, 221-34-2474
Crossett, Jerry M., 409-72-2635
Csonka, Norita F., 281-36-1205
Culling, Laurence J., 455-72-1869
Cunningham, Dennis, 276-44-2753
Cunningham, John H., Jr., 452-76-2816
Cupp, Chester L., 430-96-9525
Cupples, Michael W., 409-80-5060
Curry, Larry E., 259-80-1450
David, Joseph B., 540-56-1295
Davis, Dale F., 511-48-1161
Davis, Greggory B., 062-40-6605
Davis, Gretchen C., 243-72-6706
Davis, John W., 232-74-2659
Davis, Larry W., 559-64-3373
Davis, Patricia J., 072-38-1686
Davis, Richard C., 292-46-8183
Davis, Ronald E., 291-40-5006
Davison, Jaquelin B., 258-86-1634
Dayley, Edward O., 518-44-0885
Delahaut, Angel J., 527-60-9543
Dellinger, Joe D., 412-78-6664
Delozier, Gary R., 201-38-8939
Dempsey, Diane M., 438-62-4480
Denny, Doris A., 429-68-3342
Deroos, Douglas J., 480-52-8209
Desanzo, Louis R., 179-40-7764
Devan, Curtis L., 228-62-8750
Deyermond, John J., 025-38-7510
Dickson, Joel S., 206-38-8297
Dillon, Robert D., 261-92-7493
Dixon, Donald E., 164-38-4571
Dixon, Griggs W., Ollive., 227-60-6468
Dobbs, Harold T., 260-66-3550
Dody, Steven C., 511-48-0745
Donald, Mark J., 220-52-4912
Downs, John H., 327-42-0325
Dullaghan, Charles J., 146-44-2345
Dunn, Brian E., 031-36-9328
Durham, Randall C., 018-38-5094
Easton, William A., 548-66-9901
Edmonds, Reece C., Jr., 241-74-4957
Edwards, Steven G., 439-80-2299
Elley, Ben L., 503-56-5106
Ellis, Frank D., 587-42-4419
English, Vincent M., 226-66-4405
Engstrom, Carl B., 508-64-9034
Engstrom, Melvin G., 399-38-6666
Erickson, Robert G., 529-58-4493
Etheridge, William K., 240-82-0153
Evans, Thomas M., 276-42-1585
Ewing, Linda M., 033-38-2671
Eyler, Joan E., 280-46-5800
Fairchild, Daniel L., 427-96-5828
Farrar, David S., 040-42-3963
Faulkner, Rosa M., 580-80-9122
Fechheim, Gene 393-40-8883
Fellingham, Monte R., 563-70-7255
Ferguson, Neal A., 516-60-2762
Fielder, Jo A., 434-82-7008
Finch, Frederick L., 429-84-4570
Finch, Peter J., 228-56-3897
Firth, Joel T., 263-90-4446
Flanagan, James E., 212-54-3276
Flanagan, Roosevelt 436-80-3881
Flatt, Kevin N., 478-58-2728
Flowers, Isaiah Jr., 419-64-5681
Foley, Anthony O., 219-44-0735
Foster, Charles W., 496-48-8651
Foster, John R., 435-74-2030
Fowler, James L., 467-84-3901
Fowler, Lewis S., 279-44-7167
Francis, Andre L., 116-36-9038
Fredrikson, Jerome E., 534-40-6595
Freeman, John G., 568-68-8257
Freeman, John W., 435-74-1797
French, Gary D., 422-64-9770
French, Michael J., 062-36-3400
Frick, Joan E., 535-42-0229
Frison, Ellis S., Jr., 247-90-9862
Fry, Virginia K., 261-78-2323
Fuller, Mark D., 532-52-5245
Gahn, Norman A., 387-46-6710
Gaines, David H., 467-76-5069
George, Joe D., 432-84-7802
Germeshausen, Edward J., 562-64-8088
Giasi, Anthony J., 080-42-7226
Gibbons, Gregory D., 092-40-5333
Gibson, Jim E., 401-68-1941
Giles, John A., 415-78-8623
Gillespie, Robert E., 126-38-0441
Girardin, Robert W., 568-62-9811
Goddard, Robert D., 524-52-4503
Gold, Darrell A., 552-84-1997
Goldsmith, Lloyd E., Jr., 261-88-2698
Goldstein, Leon A., 571-68-9798
Goodwin, Kenneth D., 464-88-9705
Graybeal, David W., Jr., 263-82-3588
Green, John C., 481-62-4283
Green, Stanley E., 463-84-4130
Greenfield, Arlene F., 135-42-9854
Gregory, Chase E., Jr., 564-66-1904
Greisz, Leonard L., 323-36-0790
Gress, Robert A., 320-42-7191
Griffin, Jessie K., 548-70-3486
Griffin, Robert H., 255-76-5619
Griveas, George A., 099-40-3967
Groves, Charles R., 495-48-3427
Groves, Gary E., 252-84-2912
Gustke, Carl W., Jr., 551-76-4779
Guthrie, David E., Jr., 416-66-3781
Gutierrezrivera, Rafael L., 584-24-8083
Guy, Myron J., 286-40-5237
Hagood, Lacy E., Jr., 231-66-8732
Halek, Richard J., 535-52-9471
Hall, Gary L., 573-68-3735
Hall, Lawrence D., 260-82-5093
Hallman, Beaufort C., Jr., 249-76-4196
Halstead, Stacey L., 382-46-3029
Halstead, Timothy H., 057-42-0994

Hamilton, Francis E., 125-38-3698
Hammonds, Gary L., 450-70-7002
Hampton, Rex H., Jr., 514-44-4330
Hardwick, Howard B., 250-70-4682
Hardy, Thomas D., 263-82-3039
Hargis, Tom E., 430-90-5453
Harkins, William S., 471-54-4999
Harkness, Edward M., 206-38-4069
Harrington, Edward M., 029-34-9537
Harris, Jeffry L., 485-54-9508
Harris, John K., 571-64-0698
Hawley, Thomas E., 227-70-7589
Hayashikawa, Don K., 575-52-4712
Hayes, Sharolyn I., 556-54-5925
Hearn, Daniel W., 541-56-6587
Hedgpeth, James L., 558-68-0541
Heffley, Robert E., 172-38-5044
Henley, Donnie L., 411-76-3761
Herhusky, James H., 469-54-0384
Herrick, Richard C., 002-34-3675
Hershberger, Donald W., 186-40-5886
Hertel, William R., 482-64-3119
Heyse, Thomas G., 365-50-3791
Hibbitts, James E., 233-60-0098
Higgins, Gary L., 508-56-2918
Hill, Eloise A., 421-62-8234
Hinojosa, Ernest A., III, 577-70-7277
Hinote, Paul F., 263-84-6952
Hislop, William S., 539-42-8263
Hobin, Gary R., 091-36-2763
Hodges, Mark L., Jr., 457-74-4950
Hoffman, Francis M., 503-58-3303
Hogan, James P., 373-52-6310
Holland, Willie S., 217-50-8701
Holt, Donald H., 553-68-5511
Horn, William A., 421-56-5553
Horvath, William, II, 399-54-6877
Hoskan, Peter L., 304-48-4624
Hottell, Richard T., 532-50-2251
Houchin, Kevin A., 014-36-7786
Howard, Fredrick C., 430-90-0829
Howard, Gregory S., 568-44-3547
Howell, Michael I., 263-80-7695
Hubbard, George F., 442-50-4254
Hudson, Barry R., 288-46-6080
Hull, Marcel, 521-62-1332
Hull, Timothy L., 260-78-6966
Humberson, Bobby G., 465-88-8543
Humphrey, Frank T., Jr., 223-64-7925
Hutsko, Donald J., 376-56-7947
Hyde, Stephen R., 420-62-7464
Hyland, Bernard V., 045-42-0722
Ingrisano, Anthony F., 214-54-2551
Isaac, Garon J., 538-50-0790
Ivey, Larry E., 418-64-6515
Jackson, Alexander S., 577-66-3775
Jackson, Andres, 465-74-3058
Jackson, Jeffery D., 434-78-0830
Jackson, Ralph L., Jr., 574-16-2041
Jackson, Wayne O., 454-74-9845
Jackson, William L., 253-74-8740
Jackson, William M., 514-44-9454
James, Judith, 464-68-5626
Jamison, Sarah S., 526-82-9760
Jenkins, Harry K., 144-34-1692
Jenkins, Oliver, 427-94-8798
Jirik, John R., 476-54-8652
Johnson, Alfred L., 249-86-5260
Johnson, Billy A., 186-38-9048
Jones, Clarence K., 263-78-4732
Jones, James B., 199-38-5773
Jones, Linda C., 441-48-1302
Jones, Michael W., 425-94-5512
Jones, Raymond S., 266-96-8446
Jones, Ronald G., 503-48-7724
Jones, Tony A., 559-72-4794
Jublou, Bryant C., 136-36-7492
Jurison, Alfred C., Jr., 208-36-8470
Kaylor, Michael R., 275-46-7902
Keebler, David B., 124-36-7960
Keehr, Douglas E., 503-56-6334
Kelley, John W., 420-60-7887
Kelly, Mark J., 090-40-1103
Kelly, Richard J., 185-40-8874
Kelly, Sheila A., 529-56-6729
Kenworthy, Donald B., 113-40-1696
Killpack, Paul A., 418-64-2507
King, James C., 173-40-8079
King, John P., 440-46-8512
King, Joseph F., III, 064-38-4175
King, William P., Jr., 513-52-1942
Kingman, James M., 534-44-3492
Kinstrey, John J., Jr., 124-34-1978
Kinzer, Robert W., Jr., 205-32-0933
Kinzly, Daniel L., 261-76-2910
Kirby, William H., 221-34-3413
Klemm, Donald R., 528-70-0241
Klett, Merle D., 260-78-6933
Klinger, Randy L., 206-36-2990
Knapp, Earl L., 516-62-6811
Knapp, John P., Jr., 523-56-7949
Knox, William B., 231-62-6367
Koob, William L., III, 255-74-2005
Krepela, Joseph F., 022-38-8354
Kriegish, Stephen J., 166-40-0529
Krogue, Philip E., 528-60-4411
Labrie, Paul E., 220-54-1887
Lafleur, Irvin, 437-76-7457
Laird, Randal E., 526-76-7377
Lalande, Joseph M., III, 263-86-5695
Lam, John R., Jr., 286-44-3008
Lama, John A., 127-34-4635
Lanham, Charles T., 520-50-2383
Lantzy, Walter P., III, 211-38-5886
Lareau, Joel G., 420-64-9382
Larsen, Gerard 085-36-0155
Larson, James W., 521-74-6468
Larson, Robert M., 365-42-7178
Lasater, Glenn, 510-46-4153
Latson, Harvey H., III, 299-44-9035
Lattimore, Stephen W., 534-46-7423
Ledman, Richard W., 479-58-4414
Lee, Barbara A., 229-54-9971
Leeds, Richard L., Jr., 128-34-6998
Lehman, Robert Y., 231-62-8695
Leighton, Larry D., 505-66-7764
Lenz, David E., 395-50-1843
Lenzini, Tommy J., 467-70-9934
Lenzmeier, Timothy J., 536-50-5876
Leonard, Godfrey M., 162-40-2747
Leonard, James R., 294-40-4858
Levenson, Michael R., 317-44-0701
Lewis, Albert E., Jr., 552-84-5486
Lewis, William A., 266-74-5170
Lewter, Alan A., 521-48-7849
Lian, Mark S., 502-56-8771
Lindsay, William B., 465-74-0978
Lindsey, Martin L., III, 239-78-9684
Ling, David E., 143-38-9156
Lipp, David T., 327-36-3482
Locke, Howard E., Jr., 409-76-8988
Logan, Kenneth O., 231-68-2866
Lopez, Carol S., 219-56-5724
Lovatt, Brian A., 023-40-2726
Loveland, Johnson C., 262-82-0697
Loveless, Henry C., 222-28-4359
Lucas, Javors J., Jr., 259-76-7453
Lumpkin, Barry C., 256-74-1919
Lumpkin, Charles D., 462-88-1660
Lund, Richard A., 308-52-2773
Lyon, Virgil C., 283-46-9702
MacLeod, David M., 430-76-2653
Maffei, Francis R., III, 183-36-3497
Maline, John P., 568-78-6846
Malloy, Robert J., 554-64-4500
Mannino, Robert A., 195-38-3286
Mansfield, Ronald B., 415-80-2931
Marcus, Reginald W., 315-52-6736
Markun, Jerome C., 225-70-8526
Marnell, Roger A., 506-46-2987
Marshall, Tommy H., 465-60-9028
Martin, Gary D., 510-50-9410
Maskal, Thomas P., 544-52-6360
Matta, Ralph D., 463-74-5154
Matteson, Wallace E., 083-42-7220
May, Jeffery J., 090-38-9374
McCabe, Bernard J., Jr., 318-38-7512
McCauley, Roger E., Jr., 567-84-8454
McGarvey, Patrick, 316-46-0916
McGaugh, Dennis A., 540-56-8271
McGillis, Stephen P., 531-46-6638
McKeever, Timothy J., 181-38-8759
McLaughlin, David E., 512-58-0934
McManigal, Dan N., 543-50-6418
McMillian, Willie Jr., 420-62-5971
McNamara, George T., 301-42-4119
McPherson, Larry M., 479-54-9593
McVey, Jerry A., 514-34-9978
Means, James H., 413-80-4002
Merriweather, Tony R., 492-54-8581
Michel, Theodore C., 057-38-4962
Michelson, Michael L., 216-46-6168
Mickens, Joseph Jr., 109-32-5985
Miller, Albert L., Jr., 219-52-3620
Miller, Barry W., 396-50-1121
Miller, Donald H., 561-64-4459
Miller, Donald M., 153-24-8653
Miller, Raymond J., 012-40-6358
Mongogna, Joseph B., 581-84-7454
Monje, Larry N., 494-48-5553
Montoya, Arthur D., 585-09-8116
Montoya, Roberto, 450-82-1872
Moore, Alan M., 420-72-1203
Moore, William S., 370-46-9811
Morello, Charles T., Jr., 158-38-6247
Morgan, Lance W., 228-66-9979
Morris, Richard L., 138-38-0441
Mulkey, Ronald H., 258-72-8162
Munday, Donald D., 238-72-0251
Mundry, Thomas J., Jr., 141-40-9033
Munn, Duncan P., 452-82-8518
Murphy, Gary E., 503-64-9225
Murphy, Michael C., 530-36-1828
Murphy, Michael J., 005-50-6221
Murphy, Robert T., 230-70-8897
Murphy, Thomas J., 484-60-0689
Murray, Michael J., 171-38-3111
Myers, Frank T., II, 392-50-0777
Nagy, James A., 044-38-0390
Nakagawa, Dean R., 576-46-5825
Nash, Rodger W., 436-68-8526
Neilon, Terry P., 190-40-9245
Nelson, Dean R., 217-52-8639
Nelson, Douglas T., 232-74-8959
Nelson, Robert D., 506-52-1529
Nicely, Max W., 585-10-2922
Nichol, Paul J., Sr., 110-38-4375
Nickolson, Lester G., 265-02-7158
Nizzisantiago, Carmen M., 478-58-3793
Noser, William W., 473-40-0303
Nottingham, Seth F., Jr., 223-72-4196
Oates, Robert L., 227-68-3612
Oatman, Dudley B., Jr., 569-64-6113
O'Brien, Robert J., 272-36-4019
O'Bryant, Richard L., 454-74-4008
O'Donnell, Dennis M., 102-40-5956
Oelschig, Albert C., III, 254-74-2511
Oesch, Clifford M., 490-52-7449
Olsen, Robert M., 545-70-5334
O'Malley, Gerald J., 338-36-9918
O'Rourke, James A., 461-80-9243
Ortenzio, Thomas J., 154-40-6019
Osterberg, Warren D., 503-54-2669
O'Sullivan, John P., 556-54-2678
Ott, Richard R., 175-42-0975
Ouellette, Roland L., 005-44-8007
Overmyer, Richard E., Jr., 273-42-6327
Owen, Larry L., 257-66-5303
Owens, Ellis G., 408-76-7539
Owens, James D., 217-54-1860
Pallotta, Ralph P., 030-38-3871
Palmer, Nathan T., 221-30-8162
Parham, Henry A., Jr., 232-78-2474
Park, Plesant M., III., 340-38-608[illegible]
Parker, Patrick A., 223-60-9128
Parkin, David P., 453-82-0053
Parkman, Dean A., 389-44-3094
Paulsen, Morris L., 504-60-4755
Paxton, Albert J., 573-58-7602
Pearce, Neil A., 079-36-3305
Pearce, Phillip C., 424-66-0639
Pearson, Larry D., 478-64-3900
Pechak, Barry K., 302-38-9263
Peddicord, Craig E., 513-52-8580
Pendergrass, David L., 526-80-0703
Pennington, Joyce M., 379-36-4558
Pennypacker, John E., Jr., 229-58-2289
Perch, Daniel C., 289-40-5356
Perkins, Fredrick C., 536-48-6847
Perkins, Glenn W., 008-32-7382
Peters, Rogers, Sr., 435-72-4106
Petersen, Robert P., 479-56-8252
Petersen, Thomas P., 291-44-3259

Petrina, Glenn J., 248-80-0346
Pfisterer, Lawrence E., 165-40-0080
Philips, George K., 561-64-4279
Phillips, Tommy L., 240-72-7564
Pickett, Leo A., 306-50-5140
Pickett, Roger M., 243-84-3733
Pitman, Robert K., 231-68-0733
Pittman, James T., Jr., 266-74-0612
Pittman, John H., 541-54-8376
Planchon, John T., 498-52-0898
Plucker, Julius V., 156-36-4627
Poirrier, John E., 437-74-8202
Polley, Cleo G., 503-48-2886
Pope, Glynn E., 418-56-2222
Preston, James L., 260-76-0736
Price, David C., 228-70-5453
Prokopec, Robert C., 081-38-4764
Pryke, Richard F., 171-40-2493
Pullen, James L., Jr., 523-60-0338
Pullen, John M., 235-76-7897
Pulscher, William R., 504-56-1776
Pyatt, Charles E., 498-52-1258
Racioppi, Thomas A., 142-42-8775
Radencic, Walter G., 266-86-0337
Radunzel, Ronald S., 387-52-0555
Rash, Christopher K., 250-84-1204
Reames, Joseph M., 267-74-4416
Reeder, Alan D., 422-58-8503
Reeve, Thomas G., 503-58-8377
Revilla, Victoria, 467-84-3835
Reyers, William F., 156-36-4186
Reynolds, James C., 559-72-3981
Rhame, Harold E., 436-74-5216
Richard, Thomas D., 375-44-6168
Richardson, James L., 585-22-0627
Riding, John K., 529-60-5888
Roach, Allan L., 313-52-3032
Roberts, Matthew D., 041-38-0487
Roberts, Michael S., 414-72-1208
Robertson, Joseph C., 227-62-1271
Robison, James P., 223-66-4239
Roddey, John F., 249-80-2029
Roe, Linas A., 492-50-8431
Ronyak, George M., 474-46-5214
Rooney, Shawn T., 154-40-2002
Roope, William R., 523-68-0143
Roser, David P., 306-52-9543
Ross, Danny W., 163-40-5147
Ross, Samuel W., 518-56-8441
Roth, Ronald H., 452-82-1101
Rountree, Claude M., 248-86-2977
Rowan, Michael J., 124-36-7488
Ruhlman, Mark L., 108-40-0716
Rumple, Thomas M., 375-50-2787
Rupert, Mary L., 374-44-4875
Rutledge, Larry F., 495-56-1946
Sabo, Louis G., Jr., 382-48-1191
Salinas, Juan J., 463-82-5763
Salmeron, Samuel S., 451-76-0784
Salmon, Gregory R., 515-48-1847
Samek, John D., 261-66-9902
Samuelson, Charles W., 219-46-5847
Sanders, Dale W., 490-54-8202
Sanders, Gustave R., 252-74-9399
Sanford, Richard L., 368-48-4433
Santiago, Jose J., 584-20-5363
Santulli, Paul M., 119-40-1343
Sassman, Gregory F., 539-42-5507
Savage, Lowell C., Jr., 225-70-4121
Saxton, Melton P., Jr., 260-72-6356
Schaffnit, Vilas W., 040-32-8575
Schoffman, Robert P., 475-50-5541
Scott, Sharon L., 565-64-3482
Segawa, Stanley Y., 575-52-1895
Self, Charles J., 403-68-5357
Sensi, John J., 148-42-2670
Serviss, Wayne W., 340-38-3439
Seymour, Roger W., 078-40-8651
Shaffer, Robert S., 311-52-9141
Sharp, David A., 048-40-6317
Shaw, John L., Jr., 159-42-7989
Shaw, Mary L., 381-48-2981
Shea, John L., Jr., 464-72-6122
Shelton, Charles D., 567-62-7567
Shepard, Roger C., 378-50-2906
Sheridan, Francis D., 207-36-1016
Sherman, Donald E., 504-58-1732
Shinn, Michael E., 239-74-7063
Shippee, William H., 038-32-3084
Shirley, William R., 232-80-6338
Shutt, Leo A., 283-46-4282
Simmons, Donald A., 411-74-7236
Simmons, Michael L., 531-48-4756
Simmons, Robert W., 414-80-6301
Sitler, William J., 053-40-9046
Skaggs, Melton N., 252-74-4604
Slater, Rodney L., 532-48-6027
Sledge, Elton S., Jr., 205-38-5894
Smeds, Russell C., 231-60-6644
Smith, David L., 232-74-7165
Smith, Earl W., 515-42-3148
Smith, Herman M., 241-76-6641
Smith, Jackie C., 429-82-6442
Smith, Johnny L., 250-90-3730
Smith, Michael L., 402-70-7670
Smith, Pennington P., Jr., 437-62-2621
Smith, Ulysses, 256-70-4218
Smith, Willie H., Jr., 259-76-5433
Smukalla, Ervin A., 391-42-6248
Solvey, Larry V., 291-48-0519
Sosnowski, Gary R., 094-36-9505
Soule, Dennis L., 021-34-8097
Sparks, Larry A., 402-70-2185
Speare, Edwin C., 516-60-8584
Speigal, Thomas J., 270-46-2524
Spillane, Thomas M., 299-44-1705
Spodeck, Walter D., 409-80-0178
Sprouse, Barry S., 232-74-7378
Stamour, Robert P., 005-48-9587
Startzel, Gerald E., Jr., 228-68-6526
Steimer, Gary R., 059-42-5558
Stockl, Ludwig, 259-68-2131
Stoermer, Terry A., 316-48-8586
Stokes, Ronald E., 219-40-5865
Stone, Wyman R., Jr., 577-64-2630
Sturmer, Ronald T., 365-48-0889
Suchoski, David P., 537-44-2847
Summerford, Earl E., Jr., 252-84-2043
Swartzlander, Larry A., 298-46-9130
Swilley, Alvin N., III, 227-66-7464
Szabados, Paul D., 268-46-1655
Takahashi, Bert H., 575-54-7261
Taranto, Clarence P., 442-52-5652
Tate, William C., 427-98-1695
Tavares, Edward J., 010-38-3083
Taylor, Benjamin L., 517-58-0339
Taylor, Craig C., 292-34-2116
Taylor, William H., 237-74-7134
Teichman, David A., 431-82-9156
Tennimon, Dannie E., 511-52-4343
Terrell, Bruce E., 255-78-9959
Theodore, Peter C., 088-38-6908
Thomas, John I., 273-40-1550
Thomas, Larry G., 422-52-5678
Thompson, William L., 456-72-1415
Thorn, Charles T., 431-84-6403
Thurnher, George J., Jr., 110-36-4759
Tibbs, Jerry W., 457-74-6198
Tillman, Charles, 535-40-2574
Tobin, Leonard M., 048-44-7569
Todd, Jon H., 530-34-0669
Tollette, Ronald E., Jr., 570-76-5860
Townsend, Dwight L., 439-62-8671
Trahan, Paul P., 024-36-9944
Trezise, Robert B., 527-72-6205
Trien, Joseph P., N., 220-50-5430
Trollinger, Laural L., 242-80-9127
Tucker, Kelly M., 424-64-2645
Tucker, Roy, Jr., 574-16-93[illegible]
Vanarsdale, Layne A., 521-68-9278
Vanderwarker, Robert N., 011-38-3048
Vandezande, Ernest J., 224-62-1407
Vannan, William P., 221-36-1168
Velez, Raymond, 102-38-1997
Vereecken, William R., 463-72-5939
Vermillion, David J., 308-46-1214
Vester, Claudia S., 296-42-8281
Vied, Charles H., 250-74-3790
Vonkaenel, John J., 249-88-3992
Wade, Kermit W., 452-66-4172
Waite, James A., 574-18-0099
Waldo, Bart K., 366-54-6540
Walker, Larry J., 429-90-1471
Walpole, Kinlcoh C., Jr., 002-32-0150
Wann, Roger D., 541-58-4882
Ward, John M., 552-76-3282
Waters, James K., Jr., 185-36-4987
Webb, Marcia A., 347-32-6296
Weber, Jon C., 544-56-4373
Weems, Dennis L., 556-78-5148
Wells, Duane A., 379-50-5765
Welsh, William J., 404-74-8143
Wening, John A., 290-42-7924
Weston, Charles W., Jr., 227-64-9406
White, Oscar N., Jr., 411-84-4880
Whitebread, David H., 485-62-5816
Whitehead, Alvin F., Jr., 230-68-3423
Whitmill, George M., 305-52-2065
Wilensky, Robert A., 258-76-8637
Wilgus, Alan L., 337-42-3249
Williams, Charles A., 250-82-9212
Williams, Charles M., 224-64-5270
Williams, Gary L., 526-66-0936
Williams, Ora J., 428-80-7598
Wills, Paul R., 259-76-5914
Wilmore, John G., 449-76-0938
Winter, Ronald E., 038-32-1765
Witt, Steve B., 542-60-7321
Wofgramm, Paul E., 529-64-8804
Wood, Allen R., 009-34-6801
Woodward John P., 524-60-5263
Wright, James M., 515-46-9897
Wuest, Philip R., III, 150-40-6443
Wyckoff, Thomas G., 445-48-1569
Yackley, James D., 218-48-0172
Yaussy, Mack J., 571-66-2219
Ybarra, Manuel, Jr., 467-66-6724
Yeaman, James O., 446-46-9384
Yeskie, William R., 317-46-0503
Yonkers, Leland N., 561-62-8973
Youkey, William V., 263-86-8725
Youngren, Bill, 533-46-8444
Zagars, Andis, 356-38-3896
Zec, Ronald D., 082-34-3188
Zerlet, Alice A., 258-66-1080
Zizunas, Nancy J., 286-46-6635

CHAPLAIN CORPS

To be major

Bell, Leon, Jr., 140-32-7261
Bliss, Ernest D., Jr., 001-34-3817
Bradley, Raymond E., 093-32-8273
Burns, Vincent, D., 211-30-7857
Buzby, Winfield D., Jr., 145-34-8804
Carpenter, Kenneth V., 231-58-8123
Chase, Allen P., 098-32-1088
Couchman, David M., 226-50-7039
Councell, Gary R., 378-42-2682
Cox, Robert L., 265-78-0690
Czaruk, Nicholas A., 272-40-7515
Deleo, William J., 269-40-9284
Falk, John E., 042-36-1149
Fasanella, Glenn T., 237-80-6062
Fowler, Billy W., 414-48-5168
Galbraith, Hemming L., 529-48-3803
Graham, William L., 279-32-1618
Griffin, Robert L., 260-58-2871
Harper, Carlton L., 404-66-8385
Hartsell, Richard M., 436-76-8603
Hemming, Charles W., 268-36-7770
Herndon, James L., 521-54-5666
Herndon, Robert K., 524-54-5635
Hurley, Elsiha C., 406-40-7199
Hutcherson, Robert A., 425-70-9091
Killeen, Thomas M., 471-62-1071
Kitchens, Herbert E., 429-76-6162
Krider, John L., 238-76-5220
Logan, Raymond E., 514-32-5218
McCrory, Robert D., 318-34-5668
Michelson, Helmut A., 367-36-5239
Moore, Michael D., 510-46-5770
Moran, Geoffrey H., 528-64-2457
Morris, Joseph R., 559-56-2317
Morrow, Benjamin L., 244-52-4946
Myers, David E., 204-28-9138
Perkins, Gary D., 400-62-0091
Rathmell, George I., Jr., 184-34-7866
Reynolds, Michael E., 320-36-3735
Riggs, John M., 159-24-7909
Roberts, Malcolm, III, 061-36-3962
Roller, Harold D., 421-64-6685
Schoenberg, Lorance O., 501-34-4657
Schwarz, Robert J., 346-26-0267

Shirey, Ervin L., Jr., 417-70-6033
Smith, David R., 415-68-6621
Smith, Samuel L., Jr., 248-66-7865
Spence, Donald J., 099-32-3865
Stiliha, Richard J., 040-32-5480
Thompson, Carl V., Jr., 297-46-7462
Thompson, Richard D., 217-40-4709
White, Robert N., 272-38-5604
Wight, Roger D., 368-44-9806
Wolboldt, Daniel W., 287-36-0886
Wright, Everett L., 340-34-5128

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

To be major

Baker, Arthur H., 018-38-1663
Bathen, Terry E., 572-66-5623
Braga, James A., 027-34-5180
Bragaw, Rexford T., III, 274-48-8868
Brazee, James L., Jr., 318-36-4821
Cameron, Dennis S., 246-82-6443
Goudeaux, Nolan, 436-60-3902
Higginbotham, Robert D., 225-68-0654
Johnson, Russell D., 247-86-5028
Morgan, Michael P., 264-82-3557
Peluso, Ernest F., 527-64-6542
Shewan, James W., 530-40-8714
Smythers, Michael R., 231-60-0873
Sulzynsky, Wolodymyr R., 053-40-9256
Tetters, Kay F., 543-60-9541
Trudo, Martha J., Hilgen., 450-72-4556
Winter, Marion E., 445-52-4353
Wolski, James K., 164-38-8233

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be major

Adams, Franklin H., 274-42-5255
Alberth, David P., 173-36-4021
Alexander, Robert E., 252-82-1443
Anthony, Robert M., 195-36-6014
Atkinson, Alonzo M., Jr., 258-80-9828
Bandy, Lewis C., 279-46-3623
Benson, Paul S., 473-48-1048
Beougher, Kenneth L., 373-48-5973
Bettencourt, Richard P., 028-36-4305
Blair, Hal R., 261-82-7167
Blauert, James G., 424-64-2490
Bongard, John W., Jr., 080-38-7830
Burchett, Floyd R., 314-46-3972
Burdick, Charles K., 084-36-0499
Butkovich, William A., 107-30-8506
Canik, James J., 327-42-5673
Carter, Robin J., 538-50-3504
Chaffee, John L., 504-52-0585
Church, Bobby R., 411-80-1382
Clarke, John H., 535-46-2289
Clayton, William T., 219-52-9192
Connock, Gerald M., 265-82-6081
Crain, Joe C., 432-86-7631
Curry, Donald C., Jr., 190-40-0752
Cuthbert, Bruce N., 390-50-2217
Daniels, William L., 388-44-5854
Davies, Richard W., 303-50-611
Dawson, Dan H., Jr., 455-84-0777
Dean, Henry D., 429-88-9857
Dennis, Richard A., 151-32-9581
Dennison, John R., 267-82-7479
Doherty, Joseph W., 030-32-5915
Ekstrom, Maurice F., 539-40-8483
Gainer, Cicero 255-46-9305
Gallinger, Kenneth D., 303-50-0792
Georgoulakis, James M., 356-42-2554
Gillespie, Eric G., 412-76-8630
Glenn, John F., 255-74-3841
Gower, Daniel W., Jr., 458-76-8445
Harris, Charles L., 434-82-3979
Hathaway, Thomas K., 296-44-3034
Hatkoff, Paul H., 563-56-5949
Heckert, John E., 259-84-3612
Henderson, Thomas R., 528-62-1182
Hoffman, Albert T., 438-64-1400
Hooper, Ruth L., 532-44-9442
Hopkins, James H., 258-70-0813
Horen, David L., 371-50-9720
Jackson, Morris A., 421-62-5896
Jeffers, John H., Jr., 147-38-1413
Kainz, Robert J., 369-50-7372
Kelly, Daryl J., 290-44-3024
Kinnan, Fred A., 308-52-3999
Lann, Richard S., 570-68-8475
Lawyer, Phillip G., 529-64-4846
Leonard, Thomas E., 443-44-0858
Leventis, Peter A., 247-80-4661
Lovelace, James K., 248-84-7758
Lowery, William C., 455-84-6280
Luckett, Larry W., 452-86-9122
Malloy, Wilbur W., 246-70-5718
McGorry, Charles L., III, 017-36-9066
McKelvy, Marcia J., 538-48-0336
McNair, John N., 251-78-8093
Molnar, Edward A., 278-44-7733
Moore, Charles A., 428-92-4488
Mosesman, Leonard, 451-78-2908
Moul, Michael J., 521-62-3953
Mulford, Bruce E., 018-36-3167
Nagel, Gerald A., 262-84-2435
Neary, Richard S., 173-38-0728
Niemeyer, Jay H., 340-36-7932
Nolan, Gerald, 564-72-9440
Olsen, Lamont G., 528-58-8587
O'Quinn, David W., 262-66-7442
Parry, Richard B., Jr., 136-40-8175
Patterson, Bruce D., 504-50-8115
Pavlik, Joseph J., 499-52-1011
Prather, Kenneth V., 079-38-0399
Primeaux, Larry E., 434-72-8776
Quinn, Robert E., 265-06-6281
Ratliff, Bascom W., 270-46-6033
Richards, Larry D., 376-50-7899
Ristaino, John P., 244-78-1403
Robinson, Harold W., Jr., 5050-58-8012
Romo, Michael W., 267-90-9982
Ross, Robert C., 264-56-1244
Scovill, John P., 212-54-1552
Self, Michael H., 247-84-5050
Smeltzer, Paul T., 227-64-3996
Staresnick, Peter L., 312-42-6663
Stout, James W., 519-48-7766
Strauss, Lawrence I., 053-34-5739
Tavolieri, Paul D., 025-30-5697
Trechter, Joseph M., 549-74-8461
Tyrell, Thomas M., 142-36-4324
Utter, William F., Jr., 481-40-4553
Vonloewe, Helmut, 296-44-6982
Walters, Perry R., 463-76-7907
Webster, Horace K., 264-62-3810
Weinschenk, Carl J., Jr., 176-40-0153
Westlake, Richard R., 432-86-7460
White, Stephen L., 307-48-0973
Whitmire, James C., 465-66-2166
Wu, Arthur K., 060-38-3034

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

Beattie, Bonita L., 069-42-8584
Cunningham, Daryl D., Jr., 484-54-9231
Emerson, James B., 230-72-4361
Fellows, Douglas W., 049-36-7340
McCarty, Barbara B., 283-48-9170
McDonald, Frank G., III, 363-52-0135
McDonald, Phyllis R., 244-86-6678
Murphy, Nancy Y., 216-52-1692
Petersen, Linda S., 255-82-6067
Turcotte, Judith M., 536-46-8597
Waddell, Kathleen P., 205-40-5213

VETERINARY CORPS

To be major

Burrs, Al T., Sr., 465-66-7382
Callahan, Thomas J., 265-68-2902
Carr, Michael W., 488-58-3325
Heisey, Gregory B., 202-36-7381
Hicks, Robert B., 248-80-7495
Jones, Dennis E., 322-40-4983
Mixon, George P., 265-66-3289
O'Brien, Arthur W., 429-84-0007
Ross, Paul E., 482-58-3459
Singer, Allen W., 386-48-2922

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

Amon, Thomas M., 163-40-8615
Best, Marcia, 244-78-1717
Blackman, Diana S., 432-88-5040
Blank, Jane M., 352-40-1013
Bohner, Gail E., 085-38-647
Bolt, Barbara J., 178-42-2217
Bopp, Deborah A., 217-58-0438
Brady, Cynthia A., 554-80-7468
Brady, Mary C., 105-40-2315
Bufkin, Gwen A., 211-40-7329
Buzonas, Patricia M., 173-44-2854
Callich, Marianne W., 457-98-4369
Castellan, Deborah M., 519-60-9593
Cooper, David E., 460-76-9178
Cooper, Jean A., 523-66-2767
Crookshank, Barbara J., 242-68-1271
Croze, Katherine J., 576-50-8471
Culp, Barbara J., 340-42-5196
Davis, Elaine F., 341-42-0056
Davis, Linda K., 234-76-4609
Davis, Mozell L., 410-48-1010
Dull, Linda S., 209-36-0948
Ellis, Cheryl J., 228-68-6312
Farace, Wendy L., 286-50-6649
Farrar, Gail W., 462-82-9435
Fischer, Marilou K., 517-56-8520
Franklin, Noemi O., 583-42-7384
Ganter, Sally B., 541-54-4560
Gelsthorpe, Joanne C., 387-44-3957
Green, Barbara M., 120-40-4974
Griffin, Kija K., 524-78-3351
Griggs, Rosemary, 249-96-3683
Gullett, Flint C., 267-88-2957
Gunnels, Edith P., 411-70-7019
Harless, Clotilde R., 569-64-5309
Hauser, Charles B., 501-58-5563
Hellyer, Philip D., 181-36-2581
Hetzler, Calvin L., 501-60-5546
Hollister, Diane B., 044-40-5722
Huber, Rebecca A., 492-56-2871
Huff, Clara M., 339-44-4390
Hulsey, Diane M., 488-54-9874
Ivey, Hazel I., 373-48-1693
Jackson, Judith N., 128-36-2701
Jacobson, Shirley E., 531-40-4648
Jacques, Rita C., 098-34-8356
Johnson, Margaret L., 164-44-2708
Johnson, Mildred, 066-34-8671
Kilian, Cheryl L., 246-86-4242
Klapperich, Daniel J., 479-60-6214
Klar, Angela V., 502-58-6808
Leal, Dora A., 467-84-4236
Leggett, Carla J., 188-40-8887
Lombardi, Patricia A., 569-74-6903
Mathews, Diane E., 167-42-2376
McMahon, Michael J., 475-50-2327
Mitchell, Donna C., 404-74-4576
Moon, Janetta R., 177-42-7756
Morgan, Cheryl L., 267-84-5794
Muhlenbruck, Mary J., 480-64-4959
Nairn, Angelina E., 454-74-1132
Nichols, Carol A., 307-52-8376
Norton, Dena A., 433-80-4201
Oglivie, Claudia A., 070-40-4621
Olejnik, Donna J., 046-44-2332
Paddock, Deborah H., 266-92-5999
Philips, James A., 411-74-0726
Pieniadz, Carol J., 185-40-0165
Podgornoff, Willa C., 459-72-0173
Prost, Marilyn J., 355-44-9398
Rich, Irene A., 574-22-8605
Rimm, Elizabeth A., 223-76-0962
Roehr, Kathleen M., 572-86-7556
Rowe, Harriet M., 300-46-2289
Rubbelke, Carol J., 501-58-9900
Salazar, Rodolfo M., Jr., 546-64-6481
Schultz, Connie K., 517-66-1280
Scott, Cynthia M., 165-40-0173
Scott, Wanda J., 506-58-6623
Senesac, Elizabeth S., 231-70-8934
Sheldon, Vicky M., 470-54-8767
Shine, Sarah C., 116-36-9945
Sikorski, Michael S., 466-90-4364
Snyder, Richard D., 560-62-6518
Sova, Alesia K., 240-86-0339
Spontak, Janet F., 364-54-8384
Steinbrueck, Patrice G., 190-42-6199
Stephenson, Sandra B., 216-50-3447
Stoffel, Janet M., 477-60-0553
Sutton, Glena J., 451-90-3235
Tammen, Rebecca L., 417-76-1008
Terlecki, Lucile Q., 453-72-9496
Thacker, Karin E., 376-54-2968

Thomason, Jasper W., 242-56-6009
Thorpe, Linda J., 220-52-6154
Tondini, David E., 334-40-6776
Tracy, Kathleen M., 228-74-5960
Urick, Beverly K., 545-84-4086
Uttech, Mary J., 057-44-8093
Vanbenschoten, Lucinda M., 121-36-3650
Vance, Sandra L., 559-88-0745
Veasey, Debbie H., 415-80-3556
Virgil, Jephthah T., 252-80-2770
Walker, Charlene H., 524-66-1788
Walker, Debra J., 393-54-7794
Wedeking, Cheryl A., 287-44-5147
Wier, Carolyn R., 452-66-6163
Yearta, Gladys E., 511-54-8315
Zarr, Gary D., 502-54-9363
Zimmermann, Jill, 230-74-0697

In the Navy

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and various staff corps, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Aasen, Roy Vernon
Abbott, Robert James
Able, Guy Harold, III
Abies, Alan Audra
Abshier, Randall Otto
Achille, Franklin Scott
Ackley, Victor Howard
Acton, Richard Leon, Jr.
Acuff, Lucian Mark
Adams, Adrian John
Adams, James Joseph
Adams, James Leo
Adams, Michael Richard
Adams, Roger Clinton
Adams, William Frederick
Adamson, John Chauncey
Adcock, Douglas Alan
Adcock, Fred Eugene
Addison, Christopher Lynwood
Adkins, Joseph Harold
Adler, Gary Alan
Agnor, Robert Joseph
Ahart, John Louis
Ahern, Timothy Michael
Ahlstrand, Donald Charles
Aiken, Joel Weston
Akin, Lawrence Earl
Akins, Glendon Leo, Jr.
Akins, Olen Charles
Albertolli, William Ramon
Albright, James Clifford
Albright, Jeffrey Horace
Alburger, John Francis
Alden, Robert Keith
Aldredge, Morris Hayden, Jr.
Aldridge, Lonn Raymond
Alexander, David John
Alexander, John Whitlock
Alexander, Michael William
Alexander, Ralph Leroy
Alexander, Ronald Keith
Alfieri, Paul Allen
Alford, Ralph Mart, Jr.
Allee, Raymond Maurice
Allee, Robert G.
Alleman, David Peterson
Allen, Andrew J.
Allen, Barry Robin
Allen, Dannie Howard
Allen, David Michael
Allen, Gary William
Allen, John William
Allen, Mark Edward
Allen, Michael Norton
Alley, Lindsay D.
Allison, George Boardman
Allison, Harry Kent
Allphin, James Allen
Allsopp, Ralph Stanley, Jr.
Alm, Steven Warren
Almgren, Malcolm
Almony, Joseph Robert
Almy, Gideon Wilcox, III
Almy, John Hale, II
Alpeter, William Charles
Altizer, Robert Dale
Ambersley, Robert Thomas
Ammons, Richard Patterson
Amtower, James Frederick, Jr.
Amundson, Robert James
Andersen, James Benjamin
Andersen, Richard Francis
Anderson, Barton Paul
Anderson, Christopher Clay
Anderson, Don Russell
Anderson, George Eric
Anderson, Jonathan Lee
Anderson, Kenneth Noel
Anderson, Leroy
Anderson, Marc Eric
Anderson, Merlin Francis
Anderson, Richard Matthew
Anderson, Robert Alton
Anderson, Robert Kirby
Anderson, Robert Lewis
Anderson, Samuel Kaaloa
Anderson, Terence Lee
Anderson, Wayne H.
Andre, Duane Alan
Angelo, James Warren
Anglim, Edward Patrick
Annis, Robert Earl
Anthony, Joseph Douglas
Antoine, Eddie Pernell, II
Antrim, Stanley Robert, Jr.
App, Kenneth George
Appleby, Robert Thomas
Arbiter, Jerome Lawrence
Archambo, Hubert Edward, Jr.
Arends, Stephen Robert
Arlett, Stephen McLean
Armstrong, David John
Armstrong, Keith Stuart
Armstrong, William Eric
Arndt, Stephen Alan
Arnold, Hollis D
Arnold, Michael James
Arnote, Stanley Dean
Arnott, Ralph Edwin
Arthur, Marvin Leon, Jr.
Arthur, William Charles
Ashford, James Henry
Ashmore, George William
Athow, Lewis Keith
Atkinson, John Scott, Jr.
Atwood, Roger Earle
Auckland, John Stacy
Augustus, James Robert
Auriemma, John Charles
Austin, John David, Jr.
Austin, Simeon Haile
Avery, Klurge Caraway, Jr.
Avery, Richard Charles
Avila, Richard Frank
Award, David Paul
Axtell, Robert Duane
Ayers, Carleton Royse, II
Ayers, Douglas Pierce
Ayers, James Lloyd
Ayres, Kermit Arnold
Ayers, Ronald Ray
Baber, Dennis Richard
Babetz, Jeffrey Dale
Babin, Ordale Paul, Jr.
Bachta, Richard Lewis
Backes, Douglas Allen
Bacon, William Bradley
Baeder, Robert Arthur
Bahnmiller, Michael Patrick
Bailey, Bernis Hayes
Bailey, Hubert Vaden
Baird, W. Dean, Jr.
Baker, Charles Richard
Baker, James David
Baker, Leonyx Gene
Baker, Mark Conway
Baker, Norman Eugene
Baker, Peter Arnold
Baker, Robert Lee
Baker, Stephen Hall
Baker, Thomas A.
Baker, Timothy Louis
Baker, William E.
Baker, William Harvie
Bal, Eugene III
Balhorn, Carl Dean
Balise, Philip Monroe
Balke, Phillip
Ball, John Charles
Ballard, David Lee
Ballew, William Thomas
Banellis Charles Edmund
Bankart, William David
Banks, Paul Elliott
Banks, Richard Allen
Bankston, Victor Joseph
Bannister, Clarence Quincy
Barabash, Jay
Barasha, Lewis Michael, Jr.
Baratko, Robert Edward
Barber, Charles Harry, III
Barber, Christopher Trimpe
Barber, James Walter
Barbero, Mark
Barbour, Richard Edelen, Jr.
Barclay, Dana David
Barclay, Robert Donald
Bardal, David Lavern
Bardwell, Robert Ronald
Barker, Frank Elmer, Jr.
Barnes, George Wallace, III
Barnes, John Roger
Barnes, Thomas Daniel
Barnett, James Harris
Barnett, Richard Lynn
Barnett, Stewart Roland, III
Barnum, Richard Walter, Jr.
Baron, Gilbert Henry
Barrat, James Thomas
Barrett, Donald Hall
Barrett, Frank Oliver, III
Barrett, Michael Dennis
Barrow, James Devens, Jr.
Barrow, Ronnie Lee
Barrowman, Glenn James
Barrows, Richard Douglas
Barry, Brian James
Barry, John Michael
Bartleson, George Robert
Barton, James Douglas
Barton, Walter Hurt
Bashore, Harry William, III
Baskerville, James Ernest
Bass, George Leon
Bassett, William Frederick
Batdorf, Richard Earl
Bateman, Clifford Banks
Bateman, James Alexander
Bathgate, John Craig
Batteen, Earl R., Jr.
Baucom, Larry Clifford
Bauer, Louis William
Bauer, Michael Joseph
Bauman, James Lawrence
Bauman, Ronald Bruce
Baumann, Bruce A. J.
Baumgartner, William Edward
Baylis, Robert Owen
Beach, Don Franklin
Beacham, Frederick Brou
Beakley, James Edwin
Beam, Alan Robert
Beasley, Drew Wentz
Beasley, Roy Wayne
Beason, Nathan Howard
Beatty, Larry Vernon
Beaudet, Carl Alan
Beaugureau, Denis Francis
Beavers, Michael Cornelius
Beck, Allen Earl
Beck, Arthur Thomsen, Jr.
Becker, John Joseph, Jr.
Becker, Stephen Edward

Beckhart, Richard Searle
Beckman, Charles Barry
Beckwith, Donald Charles
Beelby, Michael Howard
Been, Karl Frederick
Beier, Werner John
Bell, Howard Franklin
Bell, James Michael
Bell, John Franklin
Bell, Marvin Leon
Bell, Stuart Wallace
Bell, William Alva
Bellamy, Malcolm Edwin, Jr.
Bellamy, Robert Rodney
Bellemer, Gordon Allen
Bellflower, James Alvin
Belrose, Benjamin George
Bender, Gene Paul
Bender, John Frederick
Bender, John Paul
Benham, Webster Lance, III
Benjes, Christopher
Benko, Michael Jay
Bennett, Albert Eugene, Jr.
Bennett, Richard Wayne
Bennett, Robert Wesley, Jr.
Benning, Vale Jean
Benson, Eric James
Benson, Rodney Lingo
Bentley, Richard Allen
Bentz, John Ambrose, Jr.
Bepko, John Joseph, III
Beresky, Michael Thomas
Berg, Robert Dewayne
Berger, Robert Denton
Bergner, Jon Clark
Bergo, Dennis Michael
Bermudes, Eulogio Conception
Bernard, Eugene Philip
Berns, Thomas Herbert
Bernsen, Thomas Jerome, Jr.
Berree, Norman G.
Berry, Carl Thomas, Jr.
Bersticker, Keith Paul
Berthiaume, William F. Halsey
Bertsch, Roger Brian
Betancourt, Alberto Lino
Betancourt, Jose Luis, Jr.
Bethea, William Dallas
Betzler, David Paul
Beuerlein, Alan F.
Bever, Jerry Donald
Bevers, Richard Eugene
Bew, David Fitzsimons, Jr.
Beyatte, William Edward
Beyer, Carl Walter
Bialobrzewski, Peter Paul
Bianco, Bernard Michael
Bickford, John Charles
Bicknell, Robert Stephen
Biddles, Henry Neal
Bieda, George Edward
Bielik, John Paul
Bien, Jay Kent
Bierbower, William Bruce
Biernesser, James Carr, Jr.
Biggers, Edward Milton
Bigos, Randall Edward
Billick, Dan Richard
Bilski, Anthony
Bingay, Charles Pierson
Birkholz, Howard Daniel
Bisgrove, Michael Edward
Bishop, David Allan
Bishop, Kenneth Ralph
Bishop, Perry Calvin, Jr.
Bishop, Peter Birney
Bishop, Richard Windfield
Bissell, Robert Edward
Bixler, Kenneth George
Black, Richard Allen
Black, Terrence Wade
Blackburn, Gregory Richard
Blackburn, William Rockwell
Blackwell, William Allen
Blackwood, Peter Stuart
Blair, Coy Lynn
Blair, Thomas Benton, II
Blake, Frank J.
Blake, Jimmie Oliver
Blake, Richard Earl
Blanchard, James Joseph
Blanford, Kenneth Lee
Blank, David Alan
Blaue, John W.
Blauvelt, Russell Morrison
Bleecker, James Michael
Blenkle, William George
Block, Terry John
Blocker, Gerald Clinton
Blomquist, James Hamilton
Bloom, James Alan
Bloom, Wade Douglas
Blum, George Edward
Blumberg, Richard Edward
Bock, Jim Baldwin, Jr.
Bogdewic, Daniel David
Bogle, Ronald Coombs
Bogle, William Thomas R.
Bogosian, David Edward
Bohn, Michael Knight
Bohrer, Herbert August
Boland, James Armand
Boland, Lawrence Joseph, Jr.
Bolcar, James Andrew
Bolin, Phil Warren
Bolkcom, Daniel Lee
Bollenbacher, Robert Alan
Bolt, Billy Frank
Bolton, Dwight Edward
Bolton, Patrick Joseph
Bolton, Peter Kemble
Bond, King Charles Pruitt, Jr.
Bone, John Francis
Boniface, William Scott
Bonnett, John William
Booher, Stephen Reed
Booker, Royston Terrell
Bookwalter, James Monroe
Boomhower, Paul Milton
Boor, Leo John
Boorom, Robert Francis
Boose, Marion Sanford, Jr.
Booth, Bryant Fred, III
Booth, David Henry
Booth, James Elliott
Borgmann, Frederick William
Borns, Michael Oscar
Borowiec, Richard Raymond
Borries, William Glenn
Bosley, Dale Earl
Bostaph, Joseph Timothy
Bostic, Larry William
Boswell, Charles Maurice
Botwright, Richard Edward
Boucher, David Lee
Bouchoux, Donald Robert
Bouck, William Gordon
Boucree, Raymond John
Boudreaux, Joseph Clent, III
Boughton, Phillip Gary
Bounds, Lee Edward, Jr.
Bouton, Edwin Harry, Jr.
Boutz, Allen Ray
Bovey, Robert Dewey, Jr.
Bowen, John Dennis III
Bowen, Vernon Robert
Bower, Duane Bruce
Bower, Phillip Wayne
Bowler, Daniel Richards
Boyd, Garland Atkinson, Jr.
Boyd, John Thomas
Boyd, William Kirk, Jr.
Boyd, William Linwood
Boyden, John Parker
Boykin, William Swift, Jr.
Boylan, Harold Gerard, Jr.
Boyle, David John
Boyle, David William
Boyle, Jerome Pillow
Bozin, William George
Braden, Richard Francis
Bradford, Gregory Copeland
Bradley, Fred H., Jr.
Bradley, Howard A.
Bradley, John Earl, Jr.
Bradshaw, Michael J.
Brady, Donald Robert
Brady, James Randall
Brady, Mark Lee
Brady, Michael Francis
Brady, Peter Douglass
Bragg, Noel Warren
Brake, Terry Allen
Braman, Frederick Allen
Bramlett, William T., II
Branch, Malcolm Parker
Brandes, John Charles
Brandon, George Aaron
Brands, Robert Keith
Brandt, Ted Merle
Branum, Jerome Scott
Brattland, Michael Gordon
Bratzler, David Karl
Braun, Gerald Paul
Braunstein, Wayne John
Brawn, Michael Duane
Brechbiel, Nathan Foster
Breeden, George Leakin, II
Breedlove, Rodger Dale
Breese, Jack Richard
Breitinger, Thomas Leinbach
Bremhorst, Joseph Henry
Brender, Mark Edward
Brennan, David Michael
Brennan, Samuel Harley, Jr.
Brenner, Robert Charles
Brennon, Roy Leslie, Jr.
Brevig, LeRoy David
Brewer, David Lawren, III
Brewer, Roger Donald
Bridge, Frederick Lawrence
Brietigam, Charles Thomas
Briggs, Steven Eric
Bright, David Lee
Brinck, Michael Francis
Brines, Stephen Jay
Brink, Gale Dean
Brinkac, Michael Joseph
Brinkmann, William Russell
Britt, James Frederick
Brodie, Glenn Thomas
Bronson, Robert William, II
Brookbank, Michael Andrew
Brooke, James Robert
Brooks, Randolph Michael
Brophy, James Michael, III
Brotherton, James Douglass
Brown, Alan Jeffery
Brown, Daniel Earl
Brown, David Nelson, III
Brown, Donald Claudean
Brown, Donald Collins
Brown, Fred Douglas
Brown, Gregory Charles
Brown, Harry Parker, Jr.
Brown, Henry Pell, Jr.
Brown, James Michael
Brown, James Michael
Brown, John Richard
Brown, Leroy Allen
Brown, Orville Kenneth, Jr.
Brown, Paul Robert
Brown, Randall Ray
Brown, Richard Mitchell, III
Brown, Robert Edward
Brown, Robert Edward
Brown, Steven Allen
Brown, Thomas Jeffery, Jr.
Brown, Tommy Raymond
Brown, William Burcher, Jr.
Brown, William Walter, Jr.
Browning, Dural Wesley
Browning, Jonathan Edward
Bruce, Robert George
Brunelli, Duane Lee
Brunet, Gerald John
Brunet, Tony Michael
Bruninga, Robert Ervin
Bruninghaus, Ronald Paul
Bryan, John Robeson
Bryan, Timothy Robert
Bryant, James Brantley

Bryant, Stanley Walter
Bryson, Ronald Lee
Bub, Frank Lee
Bucchi, Toney Michael
Bucelato, John Claude
Buckner, John Oliver
Buelow, John Peter
Buford, Gaston Reedy, Jr.
Bugarin, Temotio Espina, Jr.
Bugelski, Michael T.
Bulger, Richard Lee
Bulmer, William Richard
Bunce, James Standish
Bunnell, David Lee
Burbrink, Roger Ronald
Burgess, David Ross
Burgin, William Edward, Jr.
Burin, James Michael
Burk, Othie Galen
Burkett, Harvey Benton
Burlin, David Stevenson
Burnett, Lewis F.
Burnham, Johnny William, Jr.
Burnham, Robert Miller
Burns, Allen Dale
Burns, Richard John
Burr, Richard Henry
Burtchell, Steven Gerard
Burton, John Howard
Busching, William
Bush, Frank Joseph, Jr.
Bushnell, Gregory Allen
Bushore, Robin Paul
Bussey, John Kenneth, Jr.
Butkus, Stephen Benedict
Butler, Bruce Alan
Butler, Charles Lynn
Butler, Charles Steven
Butler, Charles Thomas, III
Butler, Gregory Clinton
Butler, Lonnie David
Butler, Thomas Alva
Butler, William Aubrey
Butorac, George Edward
Butt, Cyrus Hugh, IV
Butterworth, William John, Jr.
Buttina, Richard Anthony
Buzhardt, Harry Olin, Jr.
Buzzell, Brian Vivial
Byles, Robert Ward
Bynum, Ronald Orr
Byrne, Neil Francis
Byrne, Thomas Michael
Cadden, Charles John
Caffrey, Edward Francis
Cahill, Edward Aloysius, III
Cahill, Philip Thomas
Cain, William Anderson
Callaham, Thomas Edwin
Callahan, Dan Lee
Callahan, Roy Howard
Calvert, Leonard, III
Cameron, John Stanley, III
Cameron, Kerry Duane
Cameron, Robert Ellis
Camp, Phillip Steven
Camp, Richard Michael
Campbell, Bruce Alan
Campbell, Cager Wayne
Campbell, Craig Vanharten
Campbell, Donald Leroy
Campbell, Jon Russell
Campbell, Paul Charles
Campbell, Richard Dennis
Campbell, Richard Lorimer, Jr.
Campbell, Robert Stephen
Campbell, Victor Hubert, III
Campbell, William Russell
Canfield, Frank Louis
Cannady, Charles Robert
Canty, Benjamin Keith
Capansky, Mark Alan
Caparelli, Richard Francis
Capilla, Livio Natale
Caplinger, Lanny Wade
Capps, Charles John, Jr.
Carde, Freeland Henry, III
Carden, Carl Ernest
Carey, Charles Daniel, III
Carey, Geoffrey M.
Carey, John Dale
Carley, Norman John
Carlin, James Joseph, Jr.
Carlin, Thomas James
Carlson, Charles Robert
Carlson, David Robert
Carlson, Donald John
Carlson, James Allen
Carlson, Robert Stanley
Carlson, William Garrett
Carlton, John Calhoun, Jr.
Carmody, Michael James
Carnahan, Thomas Michael
Carnevale, Joseph Anthony, Jr.
Carney, James Mann
Carpowich, David John
Carr, Russell Morgan
Carrier, John Xavier, II
Carrig, Michael Francis
Carro, Stephen Joseph
Carroll, Charles Richard
Carroll, David Austin
Carroll, Dennis Jerome
Carroll, Gerald J., Jr.
Carroll, James William
Carroll, Kenneth William
Carson, Steven Alma
Carson, Thomas Hill, III
Carter, Dennis Charles
Carter, James Butler, Jr.
Carter, John Carroll
Carter, John Michael
Carter, Larry James
Carter, Lynn, II
Carter, Robert Sharp
Carver, Bobby Wayne
Casey, Rodney Len
Cash, Louie Oliver
Cash, Paul David
Cashman, Edward J. W.
Casko, John David
Cassedy, William Augustus, IV
Cassidy, John Alexander, Jr.
Cassidy, Richard Michael, Jr.
Cast, Frederick Allan, Jr.
Casteel, Robert Blake, II
Caswell, Gary Joe
Cataldi, Richard Anthony
Cathcart, George Robert
Caton, Robert Nelson
Cauchon, Richard Paul
Cavanaugh, Michael Patrick
Cavender, John Benjamin, III
Cech, Kenneth Charles
Celmer, John Anthony
Chacon, Gerald Michael
Chaffee, Edmund John
Chaloupka, Allan Bischof
Chamberlain, Carl William, Jr
Chamber, Harold Dean
Chambless, James Earl
Champagne, Lee Wesley
Champney, Robert Keith
Chance, Thomas Henry
Chandler, Michael Edward
Chaplin, Robert Charles
Chapman, James Theodore
Chapple, Leroy Windsor
Charbonnett, Pierre Numa, III
Charley, Michael Bryan
Charuhas, Richard Brian
Charvat, David Edward
Chase, Andrew Barton
Chase, Dudley Harrison
Chatham, Howard Maitland
Chatham, Ralph Ernest
Chattin, James William
Check, Martin Lewis
Chenevey, John Victor
Chepenik, Stanley Barnett
Chewning, Warren Craig
Childers, Richard Dean
Childers, Robert Blair
Chin, Sheck Gen
Chisholm, Christopher Ian
Chopp, Daniel Matthew
Christenson, Ronald Lee
Christian, Robert Howard
Christian, Roy Calvin
Christiansen, Carl Smith
Christiansen, Terry Gordon
Christianson, David Laurence
Christianson, Robert Neal
Christman, John Howard
Church, Albert Thomas, III
Church, Larry Nathan
Churins, Peter Reynold
Cima, William Michael
Cipriani, Alfred Louis
Clabaugh, Cecil Allen
Claeboe, Gregory Malcolm
Claggett, Ronald Lee
Clapp, Roger Barns
Clapsadl, Michael Ray
Clark, Allan Forrest
Clark, Augustus Walter, III
Clark, Garnett Yelverton, III
Clark, George Chester
Clark, Gerald Wayne
Clark, James
Clark, Ray Wilmarth
Clark, Richard Earl
Clark, Robert Allen
Clark, Robert Alvin
Clark, William Lee, III
Clark, William Phil, Jr.
Clayton, Frederick W., III
Clayton, Richard Eldon
Clayton, Robert E.
Cleghorn, Larry Everett
Cleland, Todd
Clemens, Paul Daniel
Clement, Orrin Pierce
Cleveland, Robert Howell
Cleverdon, Thomas Frederick
Clifford, William Francis
Coates, Robert Vernon, Jr.
Cobb, William Wilson, Jr.
Coble, Melvin Alan
Cochran, Paul Reginald, III
Cochrane, John Mackay
Cochrane, Michael Jon
Cocolin, David Paul
Cocowitch, John Herbert
Coen, Ronald Lee
Coffer, Joe Ralph
Coggeshall, Jerry Wayne
Colantoni, Anthony Vincent
Cole, Christopher Warren
Cole, Fred Gordon
Cole, Frederick Byron
Cole, Richard Ward
Coleman, Richard George
Coleman, Richard Lewis
Coleman, Stephen Tredway
Coleridge, David Theodore Jones
Coll, William Francis
Collier, Dewey Russell
Collins, Charles Henry, Jr.
Collins, David Oliver
Collins, Dennis W.
Collins, John George
Collins, Martin Edwin
Collins, Neil Jon
Collins, Robert Samuel
Colton, Rodney Alvie
Combs, Osie V., Jr.
Comer, Stephen Andrew
Comer, Thomas Arthur
Commons, Norbert Anthony, Jr.
Compton, James Lawrence, Jr.
Compton, James Robert, III
Conallen, Michael James
Conaway, Richard Erle
Condon, John Kenneth
Conley, Edward Gail
Connell, John Clay, Jr.
Connell, Royal William, Jr.
Connelly, Michael Joseph
Connelly, Ralph William
Conner, Harry Merriwether
Conner, Hilton Leroy, Jr.
Conners, Jeffrey Durnell

Connor, Thomas Edward
Conrad, Emerson Seymour, Jr.
Conrad, James Harold
Conrad, John Woeppel
Conroy, James Leo
Conroy, Thomas, Jr.
Consaul, Harry Parker, III
Conte, Enrico Emil
Conway, Joseph Vincent, Jr.
Cook, Jeffrey Alan
Cook, Larry Wilfred
Cook, Louis James, III
Cook, Norman Ervin
Cook, Roger Darrell
Cook, Virgil Griffith, Jr.
Coon, Ralph Herbert, Jr.
Coons, William Eric
Cooper, Roger Stuart
Cooper, Thomas Charles
Cooper, Ward Joseph
Copeland, Roger D.
Corbin, James Harold
Corbin, Ridgeway W., II
Corbitt, James Allen, Jr.
Corcoran, Colin David
Corcoran, Thomas Charles
Corcoran, Thomas Joseph
Cordasco, Michael Francis, Jr.
Corder, Robert Allen
Corey, Robert Orrin, Jr.
Corley, Gwinn Ellis
Corn, Richard, III
Cornett, Billy, II
Cornwell, Joseph Henry
Corsey, John William, Jr.
Cosgriff, Kevin Joseph
Cosgriff, Robert William
Cosgrove, Michael Alfred
Costarino, F. Thomas
Costello, Thomas Patrick
Cote, Daniel Noel
Cottie, Joseph Archie, Jr.
Coulter, Daley Thomas
Counts, Steven Lee
Covington, Clifford Craig
Covington, George Barkley
Coward, Thomas Wayne
Cox, Earl Francis
Cox, Harold Louis, Jr.
Cox, Richard Stedman
Cox, William Travis
Coxe, William Travis
Coxe, William Kenneth, Jr.
Coyle, Barry John
Cradduck, David Charles
Craig, William Charles
Crain, Robert Levan, Jr.
Cramer, Mark Jay
Crandall, Charles Kenneth, Jr.
Crandall, Scott Michael
Crane, Jeffrey Ralph
Crane, Larry Stanley
Cranmer, John Michael
Cranston, James Spencer
Crapps, Tommie Clyde
Crawford, James William
Crawford, Keith Eugene
Crawford, Lyle Donald, Jr.
Crawshaw, Robert Ord
Creath, Timothy George
Crecelius, Frederick E.
Creed, Andrew Lincoln
Creekman, Charles Todd, Jr.
Crellin, Bruce Edward
Crenshaw, Keith Virgil
Crim, George Norman, Jr.
Crim, Mark Adren
Crisp, Dale William
Critser, Arthur Earl
Croake, John Michael
Crompton, David Thomas
Cronk, Phillip Jay
Crosby, Richard Allen
Cross, Allen Michael
Cross, James Kilpatrick
Crotteau, Robert Allen
Crotts, Raymond Bruce
Crouch, Christopher
Crowe, Robert Kenneth
Crowley, John Joseph, Jr.
Cruser, Thomas Paul
Cuccias, Robert Francis Jr.
Cudia, David Timothy
Culbertson, Frank Lee, Jr.
Culbertson, James Lowrey, III
Culbertson, John Earl
Culmer, Bruce Byron
Culpepper, James Clayton
Culwell, Joe Mark
Cumming, John Charles
Cummings, Brian James
Cummings, Harold Heuszel, Jr.
Cummings, Jon Richard
Cummings, Kevin Peter
Cummings, Walter James
Cummins, Eugene Joseph, Jr.
Curran, Donald Joseph, Jr.
Curran, Joseph Laurence, Jr.
Curry, Dennis Patrick
Curry, Robert Delong
Curry, Ronald Kenneth
Curry, Samuel Grayson, II
Curtin, John Wallace
Curtis, John MacRae
Curtis, Keith Paul
Curtis, Kendall William
Curts, Raymond James
Cutcher, John McCormick
Cutler, Thomas Joshua
Cuzzocrea, John Leo
Cyboron, Robert Edward
Czech, Gregory Jacob
Dabney, Philip Joseph
Dady, Mark Wayne
Dahl, Donald Leon
Dahlman, Carl Eskil, Jr.
Daigle, Noel Anthony
Daigle, Valier John
Dailey, Eugene Terrence
Dailey, Leroy
Dale, Charles Joseph
Dallman, Roger Anthony, Sr.
Daly, Denis Francis, Jr.
Dame, Roderick Winstead
Dampier, Craig Richard
Danaher, Thomas Patrick
Danberg, Robert Benell
Daniel, Gerald Lynn
Daniel, James Mikell
Daniels, James Norman, Jr.
Daniels, Thomas Lee
Dannecker, Ronald Howard
Dantzler, Herman Lee, Jr.
Darcy, Thomas Francis
Dare, James Ashton, Jr.
Dargo, Ronald Steven
Darling, Larry Wayne
Darnell, Thomas Richard
Darrow, Edward Eells, Jr.
David, King Jack
Davidson, William Eben
Davies, Carl Robert
Davies, Robert William
Davis, Charles Carver
Davis, Charles Christman
Davis, Dean OMega, Jr.
Davis, Edward Lyle
Davis, Gary Malcolm
Davis, Jack Michael
Davis, John Philip
Davis, John Ray
Davis, Kenneth Douglas
Davis, Michael Eugene
Davis, Neil Carter
Davis, Noble Scott
Davis, Robert Bewick
Davis, Roderick Franklin
Davis, Rodney Michael
Davis, Russell Erwin
Davis, Stanley Owen
Davis, Thomas Clifford
Davis, William Aaron, Jr.
Davis, William Leighton
Davis, William Oris
Davison, Henry Gordon
Dawes, Larry Eugene
Dawson, Donald Ray
Dawson, James Cutler, Jr.
Day, Jeffrey John
Day, Ralph Davis
Day, Robert Stephen
Day, Robert Wright
Deacon, Glenn Russell
Deal, Rocklun Allen
Dean, Thomas Emanuel
Dean, Thomas Roger
Deaver, William Nelson, Jr.
Deering, Ronald Dean
Defoore, Charles Wilburn, Jr.
Dejaegher, Richard Howard
Delaney, Dennis Michael
Delaplane, Stephen Weld
Deloof, Ronald Milton
Demeo, Michael Joseph
Demlein, John Joseph, Jr.
Demmon, William John Russell
Dempsey, Francis Brian
Dempsey, Peter Michael
Dennis, Ronald Wayne
Denny, Donald Jefferson
Denogean, Rudy
Denson, Dwight Ellis
Dent, Michael Wayne
Deputy, Robert Allen, Jr.
Derusso, Michael Patrick
Despain, William Michael
Detchemendy, Edward Michael
Detwiler, Donald Vernon
Deutsch, Joseph King
Devlin, Joseph Vincent
Devries, Peter Joseph, Jr.
Dewey, Roger Scott
Dewey, William Alonzo
Dews, Edwin Walter
Dibble, Ronald Alan
Dibiase, Gene Frederick
Dick, Lawrence Lee
Dickerson, Robert William, II
Dickey, James Allen
Dickey, Thomas Patton, Jr.
Dickover, David George
Diddlemeyer, Lawrence F.
Diekemper, Jerome Vincent
Dietz, Donald Malcolm
Dietz, Douglas Warren
Diegennaro, Timothy Joseph
Dillon, David Lee
Dimuzio, Robert Gregory
Dinger, John Parr
Dinorma, Gerald
Dionizio, Augusto James, Jr.
Disney, Donald Bruce, Jr.
Dixon, Lewis Randolph
Dixon, Loren Kenneth
Doan, Carl Edwin
Dobbs, Gary Ronald
Dobrydney, Frank Joseph
Dobson, Anthony Lee
Dobson, Joseph O., III
Dodd, Carl Thomas
Dodd, Jack David
Dodd, James Lee
Dodd, Richard Patrick
Dodge, Frederick James
Dodge, Kenneth Edward
Doempke, Gerald Thomas
Doherty, Hugh Francis
Dohse, John Frederick
Dolan, Robert Dennis
Dolle, James Edward
Dolquist, John Dean
Dominique, Leo G.
Domurat, Benjamin William
Donahue, Charles Richard
Donlon, Stephen Edward
Doolin, Robert Michael
Doorly, Dale Martin
Dote, Michael Kenneth
Doubleday, Michael Webb
Doud, William Edward, Jr.
Dougherty, Patrick Joseph
Dougherty, Terryll, Jr.
Dougherty, Thomas James

Douglas, Robert Eugene
Douglas, Terry Scott
Dowd, Andrew Scales, Jr.
Doyle, John Joseph
Doyle, Larry Spencer
Doyle, Martin Edward, Jr.
Doyle, Patrick Michael
Drake, Carroll Maynard
Dranchak, John Charles
Dreesen, Robert Wells, Jr.
Dresel, Jon William
Drew, David Otis
Driscoll, Michael Brian
Driscoll, Michael Lon
Driscoll, William Patrick
Drucker, John R.
Drury, John Lee
Dryden, Richard Arthur
Dryfka, John Edmund
Dubeau, Robert William
Dubois, William Louis
Duchesneau, Robert Edward
Duckworth, Eddie Lee
Duclos, Edward Decell
Dudderar, Raymond Albert, Jr.
Dudley, Harrison Grover, Jr.
Duesl, Frank Wesley
Duffy, Michael Edward
Duffy, Raymond Andrew
Duffy, Timothy William
Duggan, Robert Francis
Duguid, Roger Alan
Duignan, Michael Joseph
Duke, Arnold Lowell
Duke, Boyce Wayne
Duke, Russell Alexander, Jr.
Duma, David Wayne
Dumas, Edward Lewis
Dumbauld, Jerry Ray
Duncan, Michael Gordon
Duncan, Michael Joseph
Dundics, Marton Jozsef
Dunlap, Philip Stephen
Dunn, Carl Boulter
Dunn, Franklin Thomas
Dunn, Michael Oliver
Dunn, Vance George
Dunne, Patrick William
Dunne, Robert Rawdon
Dunning, Kenneth Gerald
Duquette, Marc Raymond
Durazo, Manual Ygnacio, Jr.
Durham, James Leighton
Durst, David Paul
Durst, Robert Stevenson, II
Duval, David Alan
Duvall, George Edward
Duzy, Charles Adam
Dwornik, Richard Thomas
Dwyer, Stephen Michael
Dyer, Edward William
Dyer, Joseph Wendell, Jr.
Dykstra, David Albert
Dysart, Barry Justice
Eakin, Philip Joseph
Eason, John Wayne
Eason, Richard Alexander
Easter, David Templeton
Easterday, Kenneth Paul, Jr.
Easterling, Lael Ray
Eastman, Guy Arthur
Eastman, Jon Andrew
Eastwood, George Hartley
Ebright, Arthur Lloyd
Eby, Ronald George
Eckert, Frederick Francis
Eckes, George Henry
Eckley, Glen Edward
Eden, Michael Spencer
Edgington, Bobbie George
Edholm, Steven William
Edington, Ronald James
Edmonds, Carl Harvey
Edmondson, Joel Martin
Edmonson, Albert Clinton
Edwards, Arthur Lee
Edwards, Brian Alfred
Edwards, Bruce Barton
Edwards, Daniel Dexter
Edwards, David Anthony
Edwards, Gilbert Spencer
Edwards, Kenneth Paul
Edwards, Raymond Lewis
Egan, Dennis James
Egan, John Robert
Ege, Robert Frederick
Eger, John Gaylord
Ehemann, David Arthur
Eiben, Norman George
Eichelberger, Kenneth Lee
Eick, Ira J.
Ekl, John C.
Ekstrom, Robert Harry
Eldred, William Lester
Eldridge, John Karson
Elfelt, James Michael
Elfers, Glen Edward, Jr.
Elfervig, Leonard Randolph, II
Elias, William Theodore
Elkins, Marlene Marlitt
Eller, Douglas Dean
Ellerman, Dean William, Jr.
Elles, Christopher Jacob
Ellin, Charles Robert
Elliott, Lawrence Bruce
Elliott, Robert-Hall
Elliott, Robert Russell
Elliott, Thomas John, Jr.
Ellison, Curtis Joseph
Ellison, Daniel A.
Ellison, David Roy
Elsen, Morris Eugene
Emigh, Gerald Lee
Enderly, Richard Harold
Engel, Douglas Todd
Engel, Gregory Allen
Engh, Robert Harald
England, Don Rondell
Engle, Edward Charles
Englehardt, Cleveland Duane
Englehart, William Patrick
Engler, Brian David
Engstrom, George Henry
Enright, Joseph Earl
Ensminger, Gerald David
Epley, Clinton Earl
Epperson, Steven Paul
Erb, Robert Stephen
Erickson, David P.
Erickson, Donald Philip
Erndle, Daniel Edward
Ersek, David Alan
Erskine, Robert Sageley
Ertel, Gregory William
Ertl, Charles Clark
Ertlschweiger, John Thomas
Ertner, James Daniel
Erwin, Robert Ashley
Erwin, Troy James
Eseman, Thomas Scott
Estabrooks, Joseph Orlando
Etheridge, Melvin Rheul, Jr.
Etnyre, Terrance Thomas
Etter, Stephen Shawn
Etter, Thomas Harold
Eubanks, Sam Elvis, Jr.
Euliss, James Patrick
Eustis, Harold Robert
Evans, John Charles
Evans, John Oliver, Jr.
Evans, Robert Bruce, Jr.
Evans, Robert Stacy
Evans, Steven Roy
Everett, Jon Berry
Evermann, George Stephen
Ewan, Lawrence Kirby
Ewell, Richard Curtis
Fages, Malcolm Irving
Fahrenkrog, Steven Lock
Fahy, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Fahy, Thomas Edward
Faine, Levarn Leroy
Faith, Everett Wilbur, Jr.
Falkner, James Raymond
Faltisek, Dale Wallace
Fandrei, Dennis Ervin
Faneuf, Leo Joseph, III
Faraldo, David Dickson
Fare, Freddie Eugene
Fargo, Thomas Boulton
Faris, Charles Cameron
Farley, David Lee
Farley, James Michael
Farley, John Francis
Farrar, James Stephen
Farrell, Gerard Michael
Farris, Christy Lee
Fastabend, Gerald Earl
Fath, Thomas Martin
Fauquet, Ronald Le Roy
Fawcett, Peter Formanek
Feallock, William John, III
Featherstone, John Vernon
Feder, John Heard
Fedoryszyn, Robert John
Fedyszyn, Thomas Raymond
Feeley, Michael Edward
Feierabend, Richard Carl
Feikema, Brian David
Feldman, Brian Darrell
Fellin, Tom Steven
Felloney, John Joseph, Jr.
Fellows, Mark Decatur
Felton, Bobby Joe
Fenn, Marshall Ray
Fenton, John Ward
Ferber, Allen Ashbey
Ferguson, Jeffrey Edward
Ferguson, Paul Frederick
Ferguson, Robert Andrew, Jr.
Ferranti, John Peter, Jr.
Ferrara, Bernard Joseph
Ferree, William Daniel
Ferrell, Dennis Richard
Ferretti, Edwin David
Ferriman, Robert Lemonie
Ferris, Richard Lee
Ferver, Robert Greer
Fessenden, Richard Mial
Fessenden, Richard Randall
Fetgatter, Walter Edward
Fetzer, William Woodrow, Jr.
Fidyk, William Gregory
Fiebig, Edward Rolland, Jr.
Field, Philip Howard
Fike, Raymond Frederic
Filka, Ronald Allen
Fillmann, William Craig
Fincher, Walter Keith
Findlay, Gary Steven
Finegold, Brian David
Finfrock, Patrick
Finley, Jeffrey Allen
Finley, Richard Gale
Finn, Michael Patrick
Finney, Charles Parker
Finney, Robert Dean
Finney, Robert Terry
Fischer, Edward Francis
Fischer, John Richard
Fischer, Joseph C., Jr.
Fischer, William George
Fiser, Larry Dale
Fishel, Henry Gilmar
Fisher, Frederick Bruce
Fisher, Glen Andrew
Fisher, Joseph Timothy
Fiske, Richard Paul
Fitch, David Paul
Fitchet, Charles Baxter
Fitten, John Alexander
Fitzgerald, Dennis John
Fitzgerald, Lynd La Croix
Fitzsimmons, Michael Joseph
Fitzsimons, John Richard
Fjelde, John Arthur
Flaherty, Mark Ostrom
Flaherty, Thomas Jophn
Flanagan, Thomas James
Fleming, Francis Raymond
Fleming, Kenneth Werner
Fleming, Richard Peter, Jr.
Flenniken, Michael Elmo

Fletcher, Frank Carl
Fletcher, Patrick James
Flood, Jeffrey Lee
Flood, Stephen Michael
Flores, Pablo Jimenez
Flowers, Philip Raymond
Fluker, James Andrew
Fluta, Raymond Alan
Flynt, David Byron
Fodor, Louis Charles
Foley, James Osmar
Foley, John Baptist, III
Foley, Patrick Allen
Foley, Robert Vincent
Folkman, Stewart Greaves
Follis, Thomas Jackson
Foltz, Randall Alfred
Foltz, Ricky Allen
Fontana, Stephen James
Fontz, Charles Roy
Foraker, Allen Shane
Forbes, Clarence
Forbes, Keith Cary
Ford, Jerry Wilson
Ford, John Fielding
Ford, Johnnie Edward
Ford, William Patrick
Forness, William Lawrence
Forsyth, William Minor
Fortik, Donald Floyd
Fortson, Robert Malcom
Foshay, Wayne Edward
Foster, Jeffrey Rand
Foster, Kent William
Foster, Michael Stephen
Foster, Robert Eugene
Foster, Thomas Freeman
Foster, Thomas Wayne
Foster, Willie Ronald
Fought, Earl Jay
Foulk, Donald Lamar, Jr.
Fowinkle, Charles Tinsley
Fowler, Boyd Cannon
Fowler, Thomas Vance
Fox, Frederick Michael, Jr.
Fox, Jerry William
Fox, Mark
Fox, Phillip Arthur
Frame, Daniel Alva
Francel, John Thomas
Francis, Gary Edward
Francis, John Willi
Francisco, Larry Jon
Frank, Joe Lee, III
Frankenfield, Howard Oakley
Franklin, Gary Wayne
Franze, Charles Raymond
Franzoni, John Carlos, Jr.
Fraser, Powell Alexander, Jr.
Frasher, Steven John
Fravel, Richard
Frazier, Tommy Earl
Fredricksen, Robert Arnold
Freedman, Robert Norman
Freeland, Thomas Lee
Freeman, Bruce Damon
Freeman, Harold Robert
Freeman, James Dale
Freeman, Russell Dean
French, Michael John
French, Richard Wayne
Frentzel, William York, II
Freudenthal, Paul Edward
Freybe, Harald
Frick, Robert Ellis
Frieden, David Ralph
Frimenko, Michael, Jr.
Fritchman, Wilson John
Fritsch, David G.
Froelich, Clifford Anthony
Frohlich, Thomas William
Fry, Scott Allen
Frye, Mark K.
Frysinger, James Robert
Fuellenbach, Joseph Charles
Fuller, Richard Greenleaf
Fuller, Walter Gadsby
Funk, William Ted
Funke, David John
Funke, Richard Harrison, III
Furrevig, Harold Lawrence
Futral, Donald Gordon
Gabe, Daniel Evans
Gabriel, Daniel Webster, Jr.
Gadino, William
Gaenslen, Carl Eric
Gaertner, Earl C.
Gaffney, Michael Gattrell
Gaffney, Paul Golden, II
Gagarin, Gregory John
Gagliardi, Dennis Lloyd
Gaillard, Franklin Delino
Gaines, James Egelston, Jr.
Galdorisi, George Victor
Gallagher, John Joseph
Gallemore, James Bruce
Galus, Albert John Robert
Gamber, Charles Thomas
Gana, John Charles
Ganger, David Ralph
Gannon, Harvey John, Jr.
Gano, Richard Dale
Gantley, John Edward
Garavito, Donald Eugene
Garcia, John Spiro
Gardner, Dale Allen
Gardner, Daniel Edward
Gardner, George Henry, III
Gardner, Grant Everett
Gardner, James Adams
Garman, James Marshall
Garnett, Claude, Jr.
Garrahan, Richard
Garrick, John Michael
Garske, John Charles
Gaskins, James Yost
Gass, Michael Richard
Gastler, Harold Coe
Gastrell, Philip Cotsworth
Gates, Richard Wesley
Gates, Ronald Austin
Gatewood, Joel Walter, Jr.
Gatewood, John Lindsay, Jr.
Gaudi, Robert David
Gault, Roger Wayne
Gauss, John Anthony
Gauthier, Maurice Alfred
Gauthier, Normand Claude
Gavito, Valentin Francisco, Jr.
Gawlik, Joseph Anthony
Gay, Willis Harold, Jr.
Gearhart, Michael Warren
Geddes, Stephen Schoolcraft
Gehl, Michael Thomas
Geiger, Donald Gene
Geister, Joel Albert, Jr.
Gemmill, Alan Mark
Genin, Louis Paul
George, Danny Louis
George, Derek Rea
George, William Alfred, Jr.
Gepford, Richard Donald
Gerard, Gregory Lawrence
Gessner, Robert Louis, Jr.
Getsinger, Clarence Layton
Giambastiani, Edmund P., Jr.
Giannotti, Louis John
Gibbens, Richard James
Gibbs, Dennis Keith
Gibbs, Thomas Ryan
Gibney, William James
Gibson, Robert Lee
Gibson, William Lewis
Giesemann, Frank Tyler
Giffen, Robert Carlisle, III
Giger, Charles Eugene
Gilbert, Gene Edwin
Gilbert, Richard Wayne
Gilchrist, Stanley Fredric
Gilchrist, Stephen Drew
Giles, Blaine Richard
Gililland, Robert Patrick
Gill, Jerry Dean
Gillespie, Thomas Rex, II
Gillies, Dugald Lochlin M
Gilmer, Franklin Biggs
Giraldi, Walter Rudolph
Girvin, Charles Rodney, III
Glanzmann, Christopher F.
Glenn, Phillip Lee
Glidden, Stephen William
Glover, Terry Lee
Glover, Thomas James
Glutting, Joseph Christopher
Glynn, Dennis William
Gmeiner, Rocklin E., Jr.
Goehring, Clayton Allen
Goen, Lewis Willis
Goff, Larry Hunt
Gokey, James Webster
Goldberg, Allan Theodore
Golden, Larry Frederick
Golden, Richard Ford
Goldfinch, Albert Louis
Goldmeyer, Frederick Richard
Goldstein, Abraham Jeffrey
Golle, Stephen Joseph
Goninan, Harvey Glenn
Good, Layne Walter
Good, Paul Alan
Goode, Thomas Gilligan
Goodman, Joe Anderson
Goodmundson, Gary Carl
Goodnight, Lyman Evans, III
Goodrich, Boyd Larry
Goodwin, Hugh Gibson
Goodwin, Robert Archer, III
Goodwin, William James
Gordon, Alan Lee
Gordon, Edward Franklin
Gordon, Larry Don
Gordon, Vernon Curtis
Gore, Charles Frederick
Gorman, John Joseph, Jr.
Gorman, Thomas Richard
Gorrell, Charles Bruce
Gorski, Thomas Henry
Gorthy, Alan Robert, Jr.
Gospodarec, Donald Stanley
Goss, Marlin Earl
Gourley, James Edwin, II
Gowen, Charles Thomas
Grace, Robert Michael
Gradisnik, Gary Anthony
Gragg, Charles H.
Gragg, William Larry
Graham, Robert Eugene, Jr.
Graham, William Rose
Granade, Walter Edward
Grandia, David Jacob
Graner, William Ross
Grant, Francis Joseph, Jr.
Grant, Fredrick Irving
Grauert, Christopher Michael
Graves, David Hart
Graves, Davie Wilson
Graw, Julius Arwet
Gray, Charles Lawrence
Gray, Gary Keith
Gray, Richard John
Gray, Robert J.
Gray, Robert Kelly
Graybill, Jon Gilbert
Green, James Francis
Green, Kevin Patrick
Green, Marion Wendell
Green, Michael Jeffrey
Green, Richard Howard
Green, Terry Allen
Greenberger, David
Greene, Alan David
Greene, Bobby Eugene
Greene, Brenton Clair
Greene, Daniel Fay
Greene, Darold Price
Greene, Everett Lewis
Greene, Joseph Michael, Jr.
Greene, Justin Noel D.
Greene, Stephen Douglas
Greenlee, William Eugene
Greenoe, Bartis Edwin
Greer, Richard Earl
Gregson, Mark

Grehawick, Gregory Daniel
Greksouk, John Gary
Griep, Raymond James
Griffin, James Calvin
Griffin, Paul Michael
Griffin, William Robert
Griffith, Curtis Bowers, II
Griffith, Russell Lee
Griffiths, Charles Henry, Jr.
Grigsby, Stanley Holmes
Grimm, William Frank
Grinnell, Raymond James, Jr.
Gritzen, Edward Frederick, II
Groenig, Stanley Ray
Groff, Melvin Alan
Gronemann, Bruce William
Gross, Christian Robert
Gross, Thomas Mark
Grossenbacher, John Joseph
Groves, Ronald Ernest
Grubb, Francis Bunyan, Jr.
Grubbs, Kenneth Kay
Grulli, Michael David
Gruver, William Kiefer
Guardiano, Jerry John
Guertin, Stanley Douglas
Guest, Frank Benjamin, III
Gugger, Roger Paul
Guilford, Walter Byron
Guilfoyle, Kenneth Gordon
Gullickson, Gregg Grant
Gunn, Donald Patrick
Gunter, Clarence Earl, Jr.
Gurke, Lee Samuel
Gusette, Charles John, III
Gutridge, Wallace Glen
Gygax, Felix Stephen
Gyles, Leon Leonard
Hacker, Daniel Mark
Haddock, Joseph William, III
Hadley, John David
Hafner, Kenneth Duane
Hagberg, Stephen Gene
Hagee, Carl Lynn
Hagee, Edmon Devoin
Hagenbruch, Robert Henry
Hager, Alan Richards
Haggerty, Jerry Michael
Hagood, James Timmons
Hagstrom, David William
Hagstrom, Gary J.
Hagy, Michael Richard
Hahn, Keith Dennis
Hahnfeldt, Don Vogts
Haight, Richard William
Haigis, John
Hale, John Frederick
Hale, Nathaniel
Hale, Ronald Eugene
Hales, David Dixon
Hall, Allen Eugene
Hall, Dane Robert
Hall, Garry Richard
Hall, Gary Michael
Hall, James B.
Hall, Larry Wayne
Hall, Mark Glover
Hall, Marshall Vansant
Hall, Stephen James
Hallauer, Russell Lewis
Hallenbeck, Amos Edward, Jr.
Hallenbeck, David L.
Hallett, Michael Thomas
Halliday, Howard James, Jr.
Hallihan, Timothy James
Hallman, Denis Stilwell
Halloran, John Garner
Halwachs, Thomas Eugene
Hambrecht, Robert McClure
Hamburg, James Warren
Hamilton, Baker Robert
Hamilton, Jerry Allen
Hamilton, Leon Bollie, Jr.
Hamilton, Steven Monroe
Hamilton, William Lawrence
Hammes, Richard Kenneth
Hammock, Charles Raymond, Jr.
Hammontree, Larry James
Hampshire, Eddie Walter
Hand, Leroy Corbett, III
Handlers, Robert Glenn
Hanna, Norman William III
Hannifin, Steven Patrick
Hansell, Ross Chesney
Hansell, William Richard, Jr.
Hansen, Gregory Lee
Hanson, Gary Alan
Hanson, Kenneth Warren, Jr.
Hanson, Lars Parker
Hanson, Paul Edward
Hanson, Terris Leigh
Hardcastle-Taylor, Michael
Hardee, James Bryan
Harding, Wynn Allen
Harkey, James Pierce
Harkness, George Cockett
Harler, Robert Montgomery
Harlow, Louis F.
Harlow, William Robert, Jr.
Harmon, Sidney William
Harmon, William Craig
Harms, Alfred Glen, Jr.
Harper, Gegory Paul
Harrell, Thomas Atkins
Harris, Charles Calvin
Harris, George Charles, Jr.
Harris, James Leroy
Harris, James Patrick
Harris, Joe Newton
Harris, Robert Curran
Harris, Ronald Robinson
Harrison, Jeffrey
Harrison, John Thomas
Harrop, John Kaenel
Harry, David Allan
Harry, Robert Meade
Hart, David Thomas, Jr.
Hart, George Leroy
Hart, William Smith
Hartman, Charles Ricks
Hartmuller, Roger Louis, Jr.
Hartzell, Gerry Richard
Harvey, Fred Seldon, Jr.
Harvey, James Robert
Harwell, Michael Adaire
Haseltine, Raymond Frederic
Hash, Steven Peder
Haskins, Michael Leslie
Hass, Timothy Francis
Hastings, Charles Oliver
Hastings, James Jeffrey
Hatcher, Russell Lloyd, Jr.
Hatcher, William Lloyd, III
Havel, Richard William
Hawes, Frederick Joseph
Hawkins, Bruce Wayne
Hawkins, John Braddock, Jr.
Hawkins, Stephen George
Hawley, Ramsey Marshall
Hawver, William Spencer
Hayball, Robert Matthew
Haydu, George Andrew
Hayes, Bradd Crouch
Hayes, James Alfred
Hayes, John Franklin
Hayes, Thomas
Hayes, Thomas Mather
Hayes, Timothy Paul
Haynes, Arthur Dean
Hazelrigg, Steven Adolph
Headridge, William Franklin
Healy, Donald Jeremiah
Heard, Chester Arthur
Heath, Donald Edward
Heath, Gregory Garver
Heath, Terrill Sullivan
Heatley, Charles James, III
Hebert, Edward Richard
Heckert, Craig Robert
Hedegor, John Wayne
Hederstrom, Paul H.
Heilman, Stephen Craig
Heilmann, Thomas Carl
Heim, George Raymond
Heim, Robert Joseph
Heineman, Joseph William
Heinz, Stephen George
Held, John Michael
Held, Rene
Helfen, William
Helgeson, Marc Arnold
Helin, William Cary
Helsley, Ronald Eugene
Helton, James Nathaniel
Hendershot, Robert Paul
Henderson, John Lewis
Hendricks, Leon Alexander
Hendricks, Robert Linae
Henke, Milton Frederick, Jr.
Henley, Ronald Wayne
Hennessy, Raymond Michael
Henry, Douglas Davies
Henry, Joseph Gerard
Henry, William David
Hensch, Richard Louis
Henson, Earl Oneal
Henson, John William
Herbert, Garry Lynn
Hergenreter, Dennis Dean
Hergenroeder, James
Herger, Joseph Ferdinand
Hermanson, Bruce
Hermeling, Theodore Allen, Jr.
Herrman, Larry Virgil
Hershey, Scott Hadley
Herzberg, Donald Dale
Hess, Charles Menk
Hess, Mark William
Hess, Nathan Martin
Hester, William Leon, Jr.
Heuchert, Richard Herman
Hewett, Michael Edward
Hewett, Ronald Edward
Heyworth, Lawrence III
Hezlep, Lynn Morgan
Hickey, Daniel George
Hickey, William A, III
Hickman, William Fredrick
Hicks, Fred Arlen
Hicks, Leonard Leon
Higdon, Ronald Gordon
Higgins, Edward Joseph
Higgins, James Bruce
Higgins, Robert Arthur
Higgins, Simeon Guy, Jr.
Higgins, Timothy
Hightower, Terrance Lee
Hilburn, John Ernest
Hildebrandt, Thomas G., Jr.
Hill, Billy Paul
Hill, Carl Clifton, III
Hill, Michael Lee
Hill, Roger Dale
Hill, Ronald Maxwell
Hillard, John Rains
Hillerman, Larry Allen
Hillmann, Leo C.
Hills, Ronald Edward
Hillyer, Richard Scott
Hilton, Hugh Anthony
Hilton, William Ray
Himmelwright, Heber Hodges
Hine, Jonathan Trumbull, Jr.
Hingle, Leander Leon, Jr.
Hingson, Curtis Otho
Hinman, Harry Thornton, III
Hinsman, Donald Ernest
Hintz, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Hirt, Keith Albert
Hitt, Curtis Wayne
Hively, Howard D.
Hobbs, Hurshel Benton, Jr.
Hobgood, Gordon Benjamin, Jr.
Hobgood, William Hilton
Hoden, John Gustav, II
Hodermarsky, George Thomas
Hodgson, David Alan
Hodson, Eric Staf
Hoeller, Bruce Michael
Hoert, Michael John
Hoewing, Gerald Lee
Hoff, Norman Lee, Jr.
Hoffman, Craig William

Hoffman, Herbert Stewart, III
Hoffman, James Harvey
Hoffman, John William
Hoffman, Vernon Arden, Jr.
Hoffoss, Peter Orange
Hofwolt, Gerald Lee
Hogan, Daniel Timothy
Hogan, John Edward
Hogan, Walton Lewis, Jr.
Hoge, Donald Carter
Hognander, Orville Carl, Jr.
Hoke, Mark Allan
Holbrook, Wade Dennis
Holden, Harvey George
Holden, Hollis Ward
Holder, Gordon Stallings
Holder, Paul Bernard
Holdt, Bruce Edward
Holewa, John Gregory
Holihan, Robert George, Jr.
Holland, Barry Stephen
Holland, Daryl Thomas
Holland, Frank Leonard, Jr.
Holland, James Edward
Holland, William Wayne
Hollenbach, James Warren
Hollenbeck, Bernard G., Jr.
Hollerbach, Robert John
Holliday, Thomas Baird
Hollimon, Geoffrey Lewis
Hollinger, Wayne Melvin
Hollingsworth, Arnold Gilmore
Hollis, John Richard
Hollis, Michael Kenneth
Hollister, John Edward
Holloway, Wyman Leslie, Jr.
Hollowell, Christopher W.
Holmes, Richard Thor
Holmes, Thomas Robert
Holmstrom, Garry
Holt, Benjamin Lewis, Jr.
Holt, Robert Paul
Holyoak, Joseph Glade
Holzmann, Kenneth Ralph
Homier, Paul Anthony, Jr.
Honour, Craig Gibson
Hooper, James Albert, IV
Hooper James Ernest
Hope, Roger Keith
Hopkins, Hubert Denning, Jr.
Hopping, Robert D.
Horan, John George
Hornback, James Leroy
Hornberger, William Byron
Horne, Charles Henry, Jr.
Horne, George Michael
Horne, Lance Cameron
Horne, Richard Allen
Hornung, Scott Allen
Horsley, James Burke
Horton, Daniel Winston
Horton, John Vreeland
Horton, John William
Horton, Ronnie Richard
Horton, William Glennwood
Hosier, Mark Secrest
Houck, Andrew William
Houck, Oran Lee
Houck, Timothy Lee
Houghton, David Gates
Houk, William Alvah
Houle, Normand Arthur
House, Michael Edward
House, Prentice Lee
Houston, Sam Kenney, Jr.
Hovland, Tommy Lloyd
Howard, David George
Howard, Donald Reed
Howard, John Finley
Howard, Philip Graham
Howarth, Gary L.
Howd, Robert Frank
Howe, David Blais
Howe, Robert Henry
Howell, Robert Dale, Sr.
Howell, Wayne Morris
Hoxie, Andrew Bennett
Hubbard, John Hampton
Huber, Michael Earl
Hudson, Frank Wilder, Jr.
Huff, Roger Paul
Huffman, Michael Bruce
Huffman, Robert Lee
Hughes, Charles Earl
Hughes, John George
Hughes, Joseph Alexander
Hughes, Philip Joseph
Hughes, Roger Neal
Hughes, Thomas Frederick
Hughes, William Ray
Huiatt, Keith Wilson, Jr.
Hull, David Clay
Hull, Gerald Wayne
Hull, Roger Kermit
Hultstrand, Victor Sandiford
Humberd, Calvin Chester, Jr.
Hume, John Griffith, Jr.
Hume, Robert Leo
Humphries, Arthur Allen
Hunsberger, Timothy Alan
Hunt, Conway Lansdowne
Hunt, David Eugene
Hunt, James Cornell
Hunt, Kenneth Howard
Hunt, Lawrence Barrett
Hunter, Bruce Reed
Hunter, Edward Echerd
Hunter, Harry Stephen
Hunter, Peter Green
Hunter, Robert Sandgran
Hurd, Steven Lewis
Hurley, William David
Hurston, James Edward
Husser, Louis Andrew, Jr.
Hussey, George Owen
Husted, George Gerald
Huston, Norman Earl, Jr.
Hutchins, Alfred Gordon, Jr.
Hutchins, John Gardner
Hutchison, Charles Roy
Hutchison, John Rudolph
Hutchison, John Wendell
Huth, Douglas Phillip
Hyde, Richard Webster, Jr.
Ibert, Peter John
Ide, Warren Harper, Jr.
Ihli, Carl Bolton, Jr.
Ihrig, Clyde James
Ikerd, Gail Emory
Ikuma, Gary Kazuyoshi
Imphong, Thomas Miller
Ingalls, Bryan William
Inglish, Gary Kent
Ingram, Carl Edward
Innella, Michael James
Irlam, Ross Edward
Isele, Charles Pattie
Issi, Dominick Frank, III
Iversen, Gary Kenneth
Jackson, David Leon
Jackson, George William
Jackson, John Edward, Jr.
Jackson, Timothy Howard
Jackson, Vern Arnold
Jacobs, John William
Jacobs, Robert William
Jacobsen, Lloyd Scott
Jacobson, John Frank
Jacoby, Lowell Edwin
Jacques, Harry Augustine, Jr.
Jadryev, James Mark
Jahn, Theodore Benjamin, II
James, Dempsey Dean
James, Gary B.
James, Lloyd Edwin
James, Ronald Boynton
Jamison, Michael Edward
Jamison, Philip Charles
Janeczek, Joseph John, Jr.
Jannusch, Craig Michael
Janov, Bernard
Jans, Jay Bennett
Jaques, James Alfred, III
Jarabak, John Paul, Jr.
Jarina, Michael Peter
Jarman, Roger Carlton
Jarrell, James Robert, IV
Jarrott, William Michael
Jarvis, David Earl
Jarvis, James Laing
Jeffcoat, John Phillip
Jeffries, Charles Leroy
Jenkins, Craig William
Jenkins, William Frost
Jenners, Joseph Anthony
Jennings, David Bailey
Jennings, Wayne Donald
Jensen, Gary Dean
Jensen, Jens Alford
Jensen, John Alexander
Jensen, Jon Robert
Jensen, Laurence Neal
Jerome, Douglas Jay
Jewell, Glenn Albert
Jewell, James R., Jr.
Jewett, Eric Lewis
Jimenez, Jose Salvador
Jinks, John Bradley
Johanek, James Francis
Johannsen, Michael Kenneth
Johanson, Donald William
John, Paul Maret
Johnesee, James Anthony
Johns, Vernon Michael
Johnsen, Bruce Martin
Johnson, Adolph Warner, Jr.
Johnson, Charles Michael
Johnson, Christopher P.
Johnson, Christopher Harry
Johnson, Dennis Jack
Johnson, Don Meredith
Johnson, Edward Emil
Johnson, Everett Ray, Jr.
Johnson, Garland Russell, Jr.
Johnson, Gary Frederic
Johnson, Gary Mel
Johnson, Gregory Gordon
Johnson, Gregory Harlan
Johnson, Herman Raymond
Johnson, Jack Monroe
Johnson, James David
Johnson, John Michael
Johnson, John Michael
Johnson, Larry Charles
Johnson, Leo Thomas, Jr.
Johnson, Michael Bruce
Johnson, Michael Dean
Johnson, Michael Julian
Johnson, Paul Francis
Johnson, Paul Orville
Johnson, Philip Gregory
Johnson, Stephen Alger
Johnson, Stephen Irvin
Johnson, Wade Cook
Johnson, William Fawver
Johnston, James Edward
Johnstone, Robert James
Jones, Darrell Wayne
Jones, David Leon
Jones, David Sterling
Jones, Earl R.
Jones, Harland Wilber, Jr.
Jones, Herbert Lee
Jones, Isaiah John
Jones, James Delmar
Jones, James Steven
Jones, John Herbert, II
Jones, Larry Martin
Jones, Michael Owen
Jones, Stephen King
Jones, Talmadge Craig, II
Jordan, James Abel, Jr.
Jordan, Joseph Elbert, Jr.
Jordan, Kenneth Sterling
Jordan, Robert Bruce
Jorgensen, Alfred Christian
Josefson, Carl Elof, Jr.
Joslin, Charles Loring, III
Joyce, James Murray
Juarin, David Stephen
Judd, William Hart, III
Juhrs, William A., Jr.
Jung, Frederick Eugene

Junge, Dennis Michael
Jupin, Harry Andrew
Jurand, George Walter
Jurkowsky, Thomas Joseph
Justiss, Ronnie Lynn
Kaahanui, Melvin
Kaczmarek, Michael Herbert
Kail, Karl A., IV
Kaiser, Michael John
Kalb, Richard William
Kaler, Herbert Charles
Kalil, Thomas Peter
Kampen, Roy William
Kane, John Edward, II
Kane, John Edward, Jr.,
Kane, William John
Kapinos, James Michael
Kapololu, John Akahele
Karcewski, Stanley Joseph
Karch, George William
Karcher, James Norman
Karnas, Anthony Allen
Karon, Stuart Charles
Karr, William Kenneth
Karrer, Allan Eugene
Karver, Walter Robert
Kasdorf, Roy Edward
Kauffman, Jack Emerson
Kavale, Joseph John
Kavanagh, Gary Lee
Kaye, Theodore Lawrence
Keane, Joseph Patrick, Jr.
Kearley, John James
Keating, Timothy John
Keating, William Joseph, Jr.
Keck, Alan Robert
Keefe, Richard Joseph
Keefer, Joel David
Keehn, Thomas Joseph
Keelean, Michael Richard
Keen, James David
Keenan, Michael Francis
Keenan, Philip Vincent
Kehoe, Michael John
Keith, Donald Rae
Keithly, John Luther
Keleher, William Paul, Jr.
Kellar, Richard A.
Keller, David Wayne
Keller, John Craig, Jr.
Keller, Joseph Franklin
Kellett, Raymond Arthur, Jr.
Kelley, Danny Burton
Kelley, Richard Gordon, Jr.
Kellner, Harry Herman, Jr.
Kellogg, Robert Lea
Kelly, Edward William
Kelly, Frank Boulware
Kelly, James Brian
Kelly, Patrick Robert
Kelly, Richard Anthony
Kelly, Robert Joseph
Kelly, Taylor Daniel
Kelso, Robert Bruce
Keltner, Richard Fredrick
Kemp, Curtis Allen
Kendall, David Carl
Kendall, Gene Roger
Kendrick, James Lee
Kengla, Donald Clark
Kennedy, John Joseph, Jr.
Kennedy, John Patrick
Kennedy, Kenneth Lysle
Kennedy, Kraig Michael
Kennedy, Reginald R.
Kennedy, Richard Anthony
Kenney, Daniel Francis, III
Kenney, James Francis
Kenney, Paul Stephen
Kent, Lowell Rodney
Kern, Dennis James
Ketron, Michael Gordon
Keuhlen, Phillip Joseph
Kevan, Mark Richard
Keyser, Emmett Marvin, III
Khinoo, Leroy Albert
Kibler, Rex William
Kick, Nelson Joseph, Jr.
Kidder, Paul Alfred
Klem, Michael Christian
Kiffer, James Christian
Kilby, William Gene
Kilkenny, Joseph P.
Kilmer, Milo Jethroe, II
Kimball, David Patten
Kimble, Gerald Allen, Jr.
Kimener, Michael James
Kimmel, Robert Lee
Kincheloe, Everet Vernon
King, Kendall James
King, Robert Crippen
Kirby, James Denis
Kirby, Wayne Edward
Kirk, Douglas Craig
Kirk, Robert Wayne
Kirkendall, James Edward, Jr.
Kirkland, Richard George
Kirkland, Ronald Eugene
Kissell, Peter Bernard
Kissinger, Robert John
Kissmann, Ronald Martin
Kistler, Jay Ross, Jr.
Kjellander, Jon Phillip
Klassen, Kenneth Wayne
Kleehammer, Thomas
Klein, Fred Corwin
Klemm, William Raymond
Klich, David J.
Kline, Howard Keith
Kline, James G., Jr.
Kline, Roger Paul
Klinger, James Edward
Klocek, Thomas Edward
Klosterman, Robert Charles
Knapp, Roland Bertram
Knecht, Jacob Frederic, Jr.
Knutson, Andrew Christian
Koblitz, Ronald Dean
Koch, Frederick Ray
Kockler, Frank Richard
Kocmich, Eugene Joseph
Koehler, Richard Evans
Kofoid, Ronald Dean
Koger, Gary Lang
Kok, Timothy Alan
Kolarcik, Kenneth Ernest
Kolarov, George Wayne
Koller, John
Kolman, Jerry Dean
Komich, Frederick Ross
Koning, Jack Allen
Kopacz, Anthony Joseph
Kopinitz, Seigmond Gus
Korba, Michael John
Korinis, Peter William
Kortman, Gregory Marion
Koski, Carlos Irving
Kovaleski, Victor Theodore
Kozusko, Frank Paul, Jr.
Kraay, Earl Albert
Kraemer, Francis Xavier, Jr.
Krafft, Frederick Walter, Jr.
Kral, Theodore Carl
Kramer, Dennis Arthur
Kramer, Klaas
Kratt, Clifford Leo
Krattli, Robert Walter
Kraus, George Frank, Jr.
Krause, Alan Leon
Krayer, William Edward
Kriz, Edward Dean
Krug, William George
Krulis, Richard Paul
Krumbholz, Karl Otto
Krupnick, Charles Alexnander
Krupp, Thomas Michael
Krupski, Paul John
Kubic, Tad Arthur
Kubovchik, John Francis, Jr.
Kulikowski, Joseph George
Kumpan, Joseph, Jr.
Kuntz, Robert Allen
Kutcher, Robert James
Kyle, William Carl
Kyriss, Stephen Earl
Ladouce, Ralph Jeffrey
Lafleur, Timothy William
Lagow, Michael Laird
Lagrone, James Marvin
Lahren, Jack Wesley
Lake, Gerald Edwin
Lake, Robert George
Lakser, Lawrence Joel
Lale, Tully Steven
Lalli, Louis Patrick
Lamartin, Douglass Hugh
Lambert, Robert Bradley
Lame, Philip Charles
Lamkin, Harry Brent, III
Lancaster, Emmett John, II
Landers, Jerome Charles
Landon, Philip Craig
Landry, James Richard
Landua, James Richard
Lane, Daniel Robert
Lang, Thomas Conley
Langley James Royce
Langston, Arthur Navarro, III
Lanier, Richard Joel
Lanoux, Steven Michael
Lansing, William Edward
Lantz, James Scott
Lapaille, John Reinhard
Laplant, Michael
Lare, George Adam, Jr.
Large, William Robert, III
Lario, Joseph Thomas
Larkin, Robert Joseph
Larkins, Markel Holland
Larsen, Christopher Stephen
Larsen, Larry Morris
Larson, David Allen
Larson, David Russell
Larson, Gregg David
Larson, James Rogers, Jr.
Larson, Vernon James
Larson, William Douglas
Larue, Larry Dean
Laska, Andrew John
Lasky, Ralph Carleton
Lassman, Abraham Joel
Latham, James William
Laturno, Raymond John, III
Lauer, Dennis Norman
Lauermann, Michael Matthew
Laughead, David Carl
Laughter, Selwyn Shuford
Lautares, Peter George, II
Lautenschlager, Jack Allen
Laven, Theodore Michael
Lawhon, James Clinton
Lawing, Charles William
Lawler, John Clinton
Lawler, Thomas Peter
Lawless, Patrick Hubert
Lawrence, James Ross
Lawson, Dale Bruce
Layl, Jerry Neal
Laz, William Joseph, Jr.
Leach, John Walter
Leahy, Joseph Paul
Leake, Laurence Wayne
Lear, Richard Bruce
Leard, Ernest Lee
Leath, Dudley Wade
Lech, William Richard
Leclaire, Robert James
Lee, Gary Anthony
Lee, Robert Edward
Lee, Thomas Early
Leeder, Frederick Glenn
Leestma, David Cornell
Legacy, Alan Edward
Legrow, Allan Wesley
Lehman, Jeffery Allen
Lehmann, Ralph Hans
Leibundguth, Peter Dawson
Leith, David Michael
Leitzel, Robert Lee
Lemke, Robert James
Lemkin, Bruce Stuart
Lenfant, Philippe Maurice
Lengerich, Anthony William

Lennon, Gerard Thomas, Jr.
Lentner, Russell Wade, Jr.
Lentz, Joe Blane
Leo, Barry Lawrence
Leonidoff, Leon Jon
Lepick, Mark Howard
Leppert, Michael E.
Leroy, Richard Duane
Lerseth, Roger Gene
Lessenger, Hoefert Clay
Leuschner, James William
Levinge, Charles Alford
Levy, James Malcolm
Lewis, Billy Laroy
Lewis, Charles Samuel
Lewis, Donald Charles
Lewis, Jeffrey Evans
Lewis, Jerry Lloyd
Lewis, Kirk Thomas
Lewis, Reginald F.
Lewis, Timothy Brian
Liberatore, Donald John
Lichwala, Stanley John
Liebe, William Charles
Lieberman, Stephen Leslie
Lieurance, John Robert
Liggett, Robert David
Liles, John Underwood, Jr.
Lilly, Dale Richard
Linberger, Alan Gamble
Lind, Stephen McCall
Linder, Bruce Richard
Lindner, William George
Lindquist, Robert George
Lindroos, John Frederick, II
Lindsey, Charles Morgan
Lindstedt, Russell James, II
Lineman, John Joseph
Lines, David Freeman
Linnehan, John Joseph, II
Linquist, James Earl
Lipinski, John Bernard
Lippincott, Lincoln H., II
Lipscomb, Jeffrey Ray
List, Gary Harold
Litchko, James Phillip
Litsinger, Nelson Howard
Little, Charles Ernest
Little, Douglas Bruce
Little, William Henry
Littleton, Joseph Sharp, III
Littleton, Leland Kron, Jr.
Liuzzi, Donato Anthony
Livelsberger, Francis Stephen
Lloyd, Thomas Drew
Locke, John Sinclair
Locke, William Nash, Jr.
Lockrem, Richard J.
Lockyer, William Kenneth
Loessin, Michael Martin
Logan Johnnie Monroe
Logan, Robert John
Lohmeyer, Lonnie Floyd
Lohrmann, Walter Richard
Loiselle, James William
Londot, Jack Lane
Long, John Harvey
Long, Milton Ray, Jr.
Long, Paul Bucher
Longaker, Chester Case
Longardt, Michael George
Longworth, Michael William
Lonquist, Aaron Dorian
Looft, Vincent Francis
Lopardo, John Paul
Lopes, Clyde Cecil
Lopez, Delio, Jr.
Lopresti, Joseph Michael, Jr.
Loria, Louis Charles
Loturco, James Sebastian
Louden, Peter Eric
Love, Glenn Edward
Love, Robert Creekmore, Jr.
Lovejoy, Jay Edward
Lover, Kevin Francis
Lowe, Allan Ford
Lowe, Douglas Terrell
Loyd, Robert Cameron
Loynes, James Lewis
Lucca, Duane Oreste
Luce, Robert Emmett
Ludwig, Arthur William
Ludwig, John Michael
Luebbecke, Donald Stewart
Luengen, David William
Luhan, John Bernard
Lukaszewicz, Joseph Thomas
Lulu, Michael Joseph
Lund, Jon Robert
Lund, Robert Morris
Lundeen, Roy Alan
Lundquist, Carl Iver
Lunghofer, Dennis Michael
Lunney, Francis Martin
Lunsford, Hollis Eugene
Lusk, Larry Allen
Luthman, Joseph John
Lutkenhouse, Michael Anthony
Lutman, Richard Kenneth
Lyda, William Walter
Lydiard, Jeffrey Robert
Lyle, John Michael
Lynch, Michael James
Lynch, William Daniel
Lynn, Freddie Leroy, Jr.
Lynn, Warren Douglas
Lyon, Scott Robert
Maas, Edwin, Jr.
Mabry, Robert Caldwell, Jr.
MacDonald, Douglas Taylor
MacDonald, Thomas Leo
MacDougall, Joseph Stewart
Mack, Lawrence John, Jr.
Mackenzie, Gordon Alexander
Mackenzie, Thomas Lyle
Mackey, Jesse Milford, Jr.
Mackin, John Joseph
Mackin, Patrick Charles
Macklin, Thomas Gabriel
MacLaren, William Francis
Macy, Earl Elgar
Madel, Robert William
Mader, James Frederick
Mader, Thomas Walter
Madey, Stephen Laurance, Jr.
Madren, Amos Bernard
Madurski, Paul Edward
Mady, Clements James, Jr.
Magee, Terry Edward
Maggi, Robert William
Magnan, William James
Magnino, John David
Magyar, David James
Mahaffey, Vaughn Eugene
Maher, Dennis Edward
Mahoney, Dennis Paul
Mahoney, Leon F.
Mahoney, Stanton Van, Jr.
Mahumed, Karl Arthur
Maiden, Jesse Joe
Maillefert, Christopher W.
Main, Glenn Allan
Maixner, Michael Rex
Major, Denny Kaye
Mallgrave, Fred Joseph, III
Malloch, James Edward
Mallory, Harry Burton, III
Malone, Michael Dennis
Malone, Michael John
Maloney, Patrick J.
Mancini, Anthony Joseph
Manes, Ezra Earl, Jr.
Manly, John B.
Mann, David Russell
Mann, Edward Francis, Jr.
Mann, Elmer Heath
Mannel, Robert Paul
Manni, Kenneth Louis
Manning, James Richard
Manning, Robert James
Manning, Walter William
Manning, William Beverly, III
Mantei, Robert William
Marcell, Frederick C., Jr.
Marchi, John Albert
Marco, Phillip C.
Marecic, Terrence Joseph
Marion, Kenneth Thomas
Maris, James Raymond
Marits, Edward Gustave, Jr.
Markley, Stephen Allen
Marks, Michael D.
Marksbury, Johnsten Lee
Markwell, Gregory Allen
Marlow, Francis Joseph
Marquarty, Phillip Grant, III
Marquis, Richard Longstreet
Marschalk, Peter Vanburen
Marsh, Michael Thomas
Marshall, Harold Eddy
Marshall, John Kendrick, II
Marshall, Raymond Lee
Marshall, Steven Alfred
Marshall, Thomas George
Martel, Reginald Timothy
Martin, John Thomas Oliver
Martin, Kenneth Wayne
Martin, Patrick Gregory
Martin, Peter Wetmore
Martin, Richard Francis
Martin, Robert Roy
Martin, Robert Stanley
Martin, Ronald Reid
Martin, Thomas James
Martini, Perry James, Jr.
Martiny, Leon Eugene
Marvil, Stephen Patrick
Marvin, Richard Bruce
Marx, Robert D.
Masden, Ward Beacher, Jr.
Masica, John Michael
Maskew, Rodney Max
Mason, Charles Manning, Jr.
Mason, James Thomas
Mason, Lewis Gerhard
Massenburg, Walter Black
Massengale, Saint Elmo Murray
Mast, Peter A.
Mast, Raymond Lee
Mathews, Monty Guwain
Mathewson, Raymond Louis, Jr.
Mathis, Michael George
Matthes, Gregory William
Matthews, Tim W.
Mattix, Thomas Mayer
Mattos, John Christopher
Maurer, Heinz Gunther
Mauro, Charles Thomas
Mautner, Donald Alan
Maxey, James Robert, II
Maxey, John Donald
Maxwell, Clarke Alvin
Maxwell, David George
Maxwell, George Gary
Maxwell, Gregory L.
Maxwell, Peter Nunnally
May, Albert Leonard
May, Michael Dale
Mayberry, Jack Brian
Mayer, Charles Walter, Jr.
Mayhew, Lance Harrison
Maynard, Hamilton K.
Maynard, Teddy Ray
Mayo, Robert Ernest
Mazzafro, Joseph Michael, Jr.
Mazzeo, Daniel Patrick
McAdoo, Richard Allen
McAfee, John David
McAllister, James Paul
McBride, Lawrence Cary
McBride, Michael Patrick
McCabe, Michael J.
McCabe, William Carl
McCaffery, Francis Joseph
McCain, John Larry
McCain, William Terry
McCamish, Michael James
McCampbell, David Perry
McCamy, William Charles, Jr.
McCarley, Theodore Kershaw
McCarthy, Morton Everest, Jr.
McCarthy, Vincent John
McCarty, Franklin Boyd

McCarty, James Douglas
McCauley, William Collings
McClane, James Lenus
McClellan, Malcolm W., Jr.
McClendon, Erwin Lowe
McCleskey, Dale Leif
McCleskey, Franklin Duke
McClung, Doyle Curtis
McClung, Roger Walter
McClure, Bruce Patrick
McClure, Robert Jerome
McCluskey, Richard Joseph
McCollough, James Michael
McComb, Lorne Bruce
McCombie, Ryan Joseph
McConnell, Michael Charles
McCort, Daniel Ralph
McCowan, Kenneth Edwin
McCray, Samuel Elwood
McCrory, Kenneth Lee
McCroskey, Bruce Adrian
McCuddin, Michael Ennis
McCulley, Michael James
McCullom, Hugh Joseph
McCullough, David Garth
McCune, Michael Owen
McCurry, Robert Alan
McDermott, Donald Gary
McDermott, James Kevin
McDevitt, Gerald Ross
McDevitt, Robert John
McDonald, James Murray
McDonough, Edward Charles
McDougal, James Michael
McDougal, Willard Boyd
McDougall, Fred David
McDow, William Ligon
McDowell, Joel Gordon
McElraft, Ronald Dean
McElwee, Charles Gates
McEwen, Gary B.
McFalls, Tommy Ray
McFarland, Thomas Baron
McFee, Michael George
McFillin, James Francis, Jr.
McGahan, Michael Patrick
McGalliard, Gene Richard
McGill, John Burke
McGillvray, John William, Jr.
McGough, Charles Randall
McGrath, Joseph William
McGrath, Thomas Ross
McGuire, Edward Paul
McHale, Robert Vincent
McHenry, Stephen Wesley
McHugh, Michael Lyn
McInchok, George Steve, Jr.
McInnis, Richard Dennis
McIntosh, Richard Cameron
McIntyre, Lewis Frank
McKaige, George Thomas, Jr.
McKee, Thomas Edward
McKeldin, Charles Edward, Jr.
McKenzie, James Robert
McKeown, James Bruce
McKim, John Harvey, Jr.
McKinney, Arlie Benjamin, III
McKinney, Dana Bruce
McKinney, Douglas Lloyd
McKinney, George Richard
McLain, John Herman
McLaughlin, David Earl
McLaughlin, Timothy Martin
McLaughlin, William Thomas
McLean, Bruce David
McLean, Owen David
McLochlin, John Michael
McMacken, John Christian
McMahon, Austin Carney, Jr.
McMahon, Paul T.
McManus, Donald Edward
McManus, Richard Irvine
McMaster, Timothy Richard
McMullen, Keith Wayne
McMunn, Brock Allen
McNamara, Robert James
McNamee, John Robert, Jr.
McNaull, Michael John
McNeil, Maurice Michael, Jr.
McNulty, Patrick Leo
McNulty, Paul Albert
McPheeters, James Henry, Jr.
McPherron, Charles Arthur
McQuaig, Michael Gray
McQueeney, Michael Edward
McRoberts, James Scott
McSorley, William Joseph, III
McTigue, James John
McWatters, Bernard John
McWilliam, John Townsend
McWilliams, George Randolph
Meacham, George Edward, II
Meade, Martin Carl
Meadowcroft, Robert Allen
Meier, Lyle Dean
Meister, John Thomas
Meldrum, William Garrigues
Mellin, Peter John
Mello, Gerald Charles
Melson, Frank Baker, Jr.
Melton, Daryl Keith
Melton, James David, Jr.
Merrick, Walter Forrest, II
Merrill, Dean Reese, Jr.
Merritt, Jerry Darious, III
Mertz, Albert George
Messersmith, Ronald Edward
Messing, James Arthur
Messman, George Ralph
Meteer, Thomas Dewey
Metzger, James Wallace
Metzger, Paul Charles
Metzger, William Robert
Meurer, Robert Howe, Jr.
Meyer, Francis Douglas
Meyers, William Arthur
Meyers, William Joseph
Meyers, William Thurman
Meyertholen, Joseph A., Jr.
Michaelis, Frederick H., Jr.
Mickett, Thomas George
Middle, James Leonard
Middleton, Michael Edward
Mihalak, Edward
Mikusi, Frank Charles
Milam, James Aaron
Milchanowski, Michael John
Millar, Randall Hackett
Miller, Alexander Ayward
Miller, Arlington Robert, Jr.
Miller, David Benjamin
Miller, David Damien
Miller, David Valjean
Miller, Donald Dean
Miller, Donald Peter
Miller, Gary Arthur
Miller, Michael Luke
Miller, Paul Lee
Miller, Richard Arnold
Miller, Steven Michael
Miller, Terry Alan
Miller, William Garett, Jr.
Miller, William Harvey
Miller, William Richard
Mills, Phillip Horne
Milner, Daniel Dewitt
Milsted, Charles Eugene, Jr.
Miner, William Allen, III
Minor, Donald Arvine
Minter, Richard Graham
Miskill, Donald Keepers, Jr.
Mitchell, Billie Eugene
Mitchell, Donald Edward, Jr.
Mitchell, James Patrick
Mitchell, Larry Joseph
Mitchke, Robert Paul
Mitchum, Kenneth Ray
Mixter, Henry Fay, Jr.
Mock, Jesse Ivan, Jr.
Modes, Ronald William
Modlin, Stephen Earl
Moe, George Lars
Moeller, Robert Leon, Jr.
Moffit, James William, Jr.
Mohn, John Gordon
Mohr, William Bruce
Molloy, James William
Molochko, Gerald Anthony
Monaghan, Charles Edward, Jr.
Moncrief, William Collisson
Moneymaker, Patrick David
Monroe, John Frazier
Monroe, William Howrey
Montemarano, Anthony S.
Montgomery, Glenn Harold
Montgomery, Henry Edward, Jr.
Montgomery, Robert Edward
Moody, Jack Owen
Moody, Richard Alan
Moon, Raymond Lawrence
Moon, Ronald Richard
Mooney, Thomas Richard
Moore, Charles William, Jr.
Moore, Edmund Eugene
Moore, Eric Cleveland
Moore, Frederick John
Moore, George McCullar
Moore, Harry Richard, II
Moore, Jon Prichet
Moore, Keith Tennant
Moore, Kevin Thomas
Moore, Mitchell Dee
Moore, Richard Stewart, Jr.
Moore, Ronald Bertram
Moore, Stephen Roy
Moore, Terry W.
Moore, Wayne Thomas
Moore, Wesley Harold
Moos, Kenneth Oliver, Jr.
Morales, Vicente
Moran, Gary Ward
Moreland, James Wesley, III
Morgan, James Clayton
Morgan, Michael Carter
Morgan, Michael Charles
Morgan, Newton Henry, Jr.
Morge, Kenneth Warren
Morgenson, James Eric
Mori, Donald Paul
Moriarty, Richard James
Morin, Paul Roland
Morneau, Michael Lawrence
Morrel, Michael Francis
Morris, Ernest Lewis, Jr.
Morris, John Therrell
Morris, Leon
Morse, John Prescott
Morzinski, Jerome Arthur
Mosby, David Cottrell
Moseley, James Robert
Moseley, Ronald Presley
Moser, Thomas Griffith
Mosey, David Michael
Motolenich, Stephen E., Jr.
Motsinger, Joe Allen
Motta, Gerald Annibale
Moussette, David King
Mowrey, Gary Steve
Mozgala, David P.
Mrowczynski, Ronald Matthew
Mueller, Robert Arthur
Muetzel, Michael Paul
Mugg, William Allan
Mulder, Keith Paul
Mulholland, William Michael
Mulkern, Trent Coleman
Mullen, George Augustine
Mullen, Michael Charles
Mullen, Michael Glenn
Muller, David Glading, Jr.
Muller, Kenneth Daniel
Mullins, Patrick Charles
Mullins, Robert Dennis
Mulroy, Charles Edward
Mulvany, Gregg Patrick
Munnikhuysen, Richard Dallam
Munninghoff, Jay Maurice
Munsey, Charles Robert, Jr.
Munsterman, James Ira
Murchison, Grover Richardson
Murdock, Thomas Earl
Murphy, Daniel Joseph, Jr.
Murphy, Dennis George

Murphy, Johnie M.
Murphy, Richard Terrence
Murray, Craig Harland
Murray, Marshall Raymond
Murray, Michael Anthony
Musfeldt, Ronald D.
Musso, Thomas Francis
Muth, Michael Allen
Myers, Albert Clinton
Myers, Richard Noden
Myers, Rollin Hope, Jr.
Myers, Steven Carl
Myers, Terry Ray
Nabers, Wallace Johnston
Nacht, John Joseph
Nadeau, James Claude
Nadeau, Walter Henry, Jr.
Naeve, Jerry Michael
Naifeh, William Coppedge
Nakayama, Dean Shizuo
Nance, Roger Allan
Nann, Peter Allan
Nash, Donald Hendrix
Nash, Edward Seenon, III
Nassar, Albert Nicholas
Nathman, John Bernard
Nation, Charles William, Jr.
Naughton, Richard Joseph
Neal, Larry Ray
Neal, Teddy Max
Neasham, Edwin Lowell
Nechvatal, Charles James
Nededog, Jose Terlaje
Neel, Frederick Heard
Neel, Robert Warren
Neely, Frederick Calvin
Neighbors, Earnest L., III
Neil, Robert Howard
Neirinckx, Daniel Edmond
Nellis, James William
Nelms, Larry Wayne
Nelson, Gary Steven
Nelson, George Robert, Jr.
Nelson, James Monroe
Nelson, Kenneth Lawrence
Nelson, Michael Francis
Nelson, Neal James
Nelson, Robert Charles
Nelson, Robert Edward
Nelson, William Hardage
Nemec, Johnnie Frank
Ness, Frank George, Jr.
Netzorg, Gregory Bertman
Neuhart, Mark Dickens
Nevels, Larry Joseph
New, Melvin Roger
Newman, James Ernest, Jr.
Newman, Micajah Wilson
Newman, Michael Scott
Newsome, Larry Don
Nibe, Richard Jerome
Nichols, David Fuller
Nichols, Paul Malcolm
Nichols, Raymond John, Jr.
Nicholson, Harry Xell, III
Nickels, Lowell Hadley
Nickelson, Bobby Lynn
Nicol, Henry Otto, III
Nicolin, Kevin Cashel
Nie, John Carlton
Niedenthal, William Jeffrey
Nielsen, Eugene Keith
Niemczyk, Robert Richard
Nieuwsma, John Edward
Nifontoff, Gerald Karl
Nimmer, David Sherman
Ningen, Russel Kenneth, Jr.
Nintzel, Christopher Alan
Nittle, Jeremy John
Noble, Jerry Robert
Noel, Charles Edward
Nolan, Robert Gordon
Nolan, Terry Randall
Noland, David John
Noland, James Terry, Jr.
Nold, William Frederick
Nolin, Bruce Edmund
Noll, John Byard
Nolter, Joseph Charles
Noonan, Thomas Francis
Norris, John Anthony
Norris, Richard Douglas
Norris, Rick Joseph
Norton, Chad Earl
Norton, John A.
Norton, John Alden
Nottke, Bruce Alden
Nunn, Ronald Guinn
Nurthen, William Augustine
Nusom, Frank Allen, Jr.
Nute, John Packard
Nye, Eric Beasley
Nye, Richmond Roderick
Nykamp, Bruce Ronald
Oakes, Delbert, Jr.
Oakes, John Reid
Oatley, Eugene Thomas
Obannon, Kenneth Leroy
O'Brien, James Patrick
O'Brien, Leslie John III
O'Brien, Paul Edward, Jr.
O'Bryon, Raymond Thomas
Ochs, John Lynn
O'Connell, Brian John
O'Connell, John Thomas, Jr.
O'Connell, Patrick Michael
O'Connor, Theodore John
O'Dea, James Edward
O'Dell, Charles Fundman
O'Dell, James Michael
O'Dell, Paul, Jr.
O'Donnell, Brendan James
O'Donnell, Gerald James
O'Donnell, James Robert
O'Donnell, Robert Bernard
Offerdahl, David Carlyle
Offerle, Robert Anthony
Ogden, Frank Edmond, II
Ogurek, Robert Francis
O'Hara, Stephen Paul
Ohlemeyer, Richard Thomas
Ohlinger, John Frederic
Ohn, Robert Lee
O'Hora, James Richard
O'Keefe, David E.
O'Keefe, Michael Joseph
Olde, Frederick George, III
O'Leary, Cornelius Francis
O'Leary, Joseph Lennon
Oliver, Timothy Wallen
Olsen, Charles Clifford, Jr.
Olson, David Reed
Olson, James Andrew
Olson, John Stephen
O'Malley, Barry Pierce
O'Neal, Richard Earl
O'Neil, John Edward, Jr.
O'Neil, Michael William
O'Neill, Bruce Michael
O'Neill, John, Jr.
O'Neill, John Patrick, Jr.
O'Neill, Richard Patrick
Onyon, Dale Everett
Oosterman, Carl Henry
Organek, William Edward
Ormsbee, Richard Berryman
O'Rourke, Ernest Richard
Orr, George Harold
Orr, William Daniel
Ortmann, Robert Allen
Orton, Frederick Charles
Osborn, Lawrence Edward
Oshiro, Neal Hazen
Osier, Christopher
Oslund, Dwayne Arthur
O'Sullivan, George Daniel
Otjen, Fred Morris
Otterbein, Thomas Gordon
Ottesen, James Joseph
Overall, Vernon Holmes
Overheim, David Charles
Owen, Donald George
Owen, Robert David
Owendoff, Robert Scott
Owens, Richard Lee
Oyler, John Matthew
Pacentrilli, Larry Anthony
Padgett, Gerald Allen
Padgett, John Bramwell, III
Padgett, Phil B., II
Padgett, William Richard, Jr.
Paine, William Gosnell, Jr.
Paleck, Robert Harold
Palmer, James Duane
Palsgrove, Russell Tillman
Panchura, Michael John, Jr.
Panico, John Russell
Panzigrau, Jerome Eugene
Papineau, Paul William
Para, Alan Edward
Parda, Nelson Robert
Pardee, William McKnight, Jr.
Parish, Richard Joseph
Park, David Vance
Parker, Charles Vance
Parker, Daniel James
Parker, Daniel Matthew
Parker, David James
Parker, James Arren
Parker, Lutrelle Fleming, Jr.
Parker, Travis Wood, Jr.
Parker, Wendell Edgar
Parkes, Thomas John
Parks, Edward James
Parks, Philip Douglas
Parks, William Hutchinson, Jr.
Parlet, Robert Dale
Parr, John Michael
Parr, Larry Steven
Parrish, John Michael
Parrish, Joseph Victor
Parsons, Clarence Leslie
Parsons, Hugh Pence
Parsons, Robert Eugene
Partesius, John Scott
Partin, Thomas Lawrence
Patch, Gregory Richard
Paton, Albert Smith
Patrick, Peter Devalangin
Patterson, John Bryan
Patterson, Paul Linton
Patterson, Shonnie Jean
Patterson, Thomas Gibson, Jr.
Pattison, James Wynn
Patton, Dennis Delane
Patton, John Anthony
Patton, John Collier
Paugh, David Lee
Paul, James
Paulson, John James
Paulus, Richard Alan
Pawlowski, Stanley William
Payne, Gerald Kenneth
Payne, Richard Edward
Payne, Robert Lee, Jr.
Payton, John Dewey
Peach, Ellis Robert
Peairs, Gregory Ross
Pearce, Richard Irving
Pearson, Charles William, II
Pearson, James Anthony
Pearson, Robert Thomas
Pearson, Ronald Steven
Pease, Kendell Milford, Jr.
Peck, David Lyman
Peck, James Eugene
Peck, Michael Lawrence
Peck, Robert Louis
Pederson, Thomas Jonathan
Peele, Franklin Dale
Pelt, Chester Hayne, Jr.
Penix, Larry Ellis
Pentimonti, Richard Joseph
Percival, William Lee
Perin, Jeffery Mark
Perkins, Kevin Patrick
Perkins, Richard King
Perras, Wayne Irvin
Perrault, Michael Edward
Perrin, Robert Warren
Perry, Comadore Arthur James
Perry, Eugene Joseph
Perry, James Elmer

Perry, James Smith
Perry, John Mark, II
Perry, Oliver Hazard, III
Persson, Michael Edward
Pesar, James Allen
Peterman, Ronald Ray
Peters, Kerry Alden
Peters, Wayne Albert
Petersen, John Steven
Petersen, Richard Merle
Peterson, Charles Cooper
Peterson, Craig Allen
Peterson, James Curtis
Peterson, Robert Lee
Peterson, Walter Harry
Petrea, Howard Aldridge, Jr.
Petrie, John Noel
Petruska, Andrew Michael, III
Pettitt, John Allen
Petty, John Charles
Petty, Randolph Allen
Petze, Charles Louis, III
Phillips, Braden James
Phillips, Charles Donnie
Phillips, Donald Wayne
Phillips, Thomas Lane
Phillips, William Joseph, Jr.
Philpot, Carlton Gwynn
Philpott, Bruce Ray
Phurl, John Francis
Piazza, Frank
Picciuolo, Jonathan Charles
Pickering, John Allen
Pierce, Roger Allan
Pierce, Steven Doane
Pierman, David Charles
Pike, Gerald Allen
Piland, Richard Alan
Pillittere, Robert George
Pilnick, Steven Earle
Pine, John Steven
Pinnell, Robert Brian
Pinney, John Howard
Piotrowski, James Michael
Pittet, Leroy Thomas
Pittman, Charles Wesley, III
Pittman, Norward Thomas
Pitts, John Lee, IV
Plank, Dennis William
Plank, George Edwin
Plant, Joseph Miers, III
Plautz, Dennis Hoyt
Plett, John Robert
Ploss, Richard Steven
Plowman, Michael James
Plummer, Rudy Edward
Plunkett, Albert Abrams
Plunkett, Eddie Lovell
Plutt, Richard Stephen
Plyler, Conrad A., Jr.
Poch, Henry William, Jr.
Poh, Lawrence Charles J., Jr.
Pohl, Matthew John
Pokorny, John Louis, Jr.
Pokrywka, James Michael
Polatty, David Pierce, III
Pollack, Michael Anthony
Ponessa, Alfred Edward
Ponton, Robert Glenn
Ponzo, James Frederick
Pool, James Allen
Poole, Timothy Earl
Poorman, Kenneth Alan
Pope, Edmond Dean
Popikas, Charles Frederick
Porritt, Richard Harley, Jr.,
Porter, David George
Porter, Franz Horst
Porter, James Robert
Porter, Thomas Paul
Porterfield, Richard Bruce
Posnett, William Lenard, III
Post, Richard Allan
Potter, David Lawrence
Potter, Richard Wayne
Pounds, John William, Jr.
Powell, Darrell Russell
Powell, David Lee
Powell, Frank Russell
Powell, George Alva
Powell, John Ramon
Powell, John Terrell, Jr.
Powers, Edward Arthur
Powers, Lynn Frederick
Powrie, Stuart Robinson
Prather, David Wayne
Pratt, James Wally
Prendergast, Timothy Edwin
Prescott, Jesse Allen, III
Prescott, Leonard F., III
Prestidge, Ronald Otis
Preston, John Walter
Prestridge, Robert James
Prevar, John Edward
Prevette, Henry Slater, Jr.
Prewett, John Richard
Price, Daniel Edwin
Price, Earl J.
Price, John David
Price, Michael Leon
Pritchard, Kenneth Wayne
Proes, Roger Edward
Proses, William Albert
Prucha, Robert Stephen
Pruett, William Griffith
Pruter, Thomas John
Prutsman, Richard Jay
Psimas, George Nicholas, Jr.
Pudas, Terry James
Purcell, Richard Lynn
Purkat, John Robert
Purvis, Johnny Genearl
Puryear, Eric Paul
Putnam, Frank William
Putnam, Michael Blair
Pyle, Kenneth Lawrence
Pyles, Steve
Quadri, Anton Stefan
Quartano, Anthony Gerard
Quelch, Douglas Beecher
Quigley, Thomas King
Quincannon, Joseph
Quinn, Richard Andrew
Quinn, Timothy Joseph, Jr.
Rachor, Robert Lee, Jr.
Radack, James Paul
Radeackar, Randy James
Radich, Thomas Francis
Rafter, Charles Jeffries
Ragghianti, Charles Frank
Ragnetti, Michael John, Jr.
Raines, Thomas Steven
Rainsberger, David Brandt
Ralston, Gary Gaylord
Randhahn, Gary Joseph
Randle, Grover Cleveland, Jr.
Rank, Joseph Stephen
Rankin, Robert Howell
Rannells, David Alan
Ratliff, Perry Michael
Rauch, Dale Arthur
Rawls, Robert Sherwood
Ray, David Crockett
Raynes, Gerald Eugene
Reagan, Martin William
Reager, William Reardon
Reaghard, James Anthony
Reardon, Kevin John
Reasoner, James Douglas, Jr.
Reaves, Keith Clark
Recame, Bartholomew Joseph
Rector, Jack Brown, Jr.
Reddinger, John William, Jr.
Redmond, Douglas Congelton
Redshaw, Michael Dennis
Reece, Stephen Michael
Reed, Billie Mitchell
Reed, Kenneth John
Reed, Michael Robert
Reed, William Clark
Reed, William Keeler
Reed, William Scott, Jr.
Reedy, John G.
Rees, David Leonard
Reese, Gary Arthur
Reeve, Edward Joseph
Reeves, Thomas Earl
Reeves, Wayne Ronald
Reglein, Thomas Arthur
Regula, Stanley John, Jr.
Reid, James Armstrong
Reid, John David
Reif, Gordon Charles, Jr.
Reifsnyder, Frank William, Jr.
Reigner, Charles Buchanan
Reilly, David James
Reinhardt, William Henry, III
Reitz, Stephen Leslie
Remer, James Wesley
Renfree, Peter Rodman
Renzelman, Ralph F., Jr.
Repicky, John Joseph, Jr.
Resavage, Roy Douglas
Resing, David Claude
Revolinsky, Jospeh Albert
Reynolds, Gary Alan
Reynolds, John Charles
Reynolds, Rickie Gene
Rhoades, Richard James
Rhodes, George Samuel
Rhodes, Gregory Kent
Rhodes, John Albert
Rhodes, Thomas Walker, Jr.
Rhudy, Carl Emory
Ribaudo, Nicholas Ross
Rice, Arleigh Hamilton, Jr.
Rice, Charles Oliver
Rice, Donald S.
Rice, Robert Ernest, Jr.
Richardo, Fortunato, Jr.
Richards, Nicholas Ladell
Richards, Philip Earl
Richards, Richard Noel
Richards, Thomas Russell
Richardson, Arthur Lee, II
Richardson, Harmon B., III
Richardson, Isaac Eugene, III
Richardson, Jack
Richardson, James Dana
Richardson, James Julian, III
Richardson, Kenneth Alan
Richardson, Paul Fredrick
Richey, Stephen Thomas
Rickman, Gary Lee
Rickman, Loy Doyle, Jr.
Rickman, William Lee
Riddile, Andrew Spencer
Riddle, Richard Arnold
Ridgway, Donald Craig
Riedy, John Alvin
Riegel, Michael Glenn
Riegger, Robert Ronald
Riera, Robert Emmett, Jr.
Ries, Stephen Hamilton
Rieth, Joseph Charles, Jr.
Rieve, Robert Murray
Riffer, William James
Riffle, Donald Lee
Rigg, Gary Lynn
Riley, Benjamin Price, III
Riley, David Gerald
Riley, Francis Clair, Jr.
Riley, Stephen Eugene
Ringer, Charles Edward, Jr.
Rinn, Paul Xavier
Riordan, Michael Eugene
Riordan, Stephen Joseph, Jr.
Rioux, Michael Francis
Rish, Robert David
Rist, Donald Francis
Ristorcelli, Charles Thomas
Ritzert, Bernard Urban, Jr.
Rivenes, Iver John, III
Rivera, Robert
Rizzi, Robert Anthony
Roach, John James, III
Robbins Brian Arthur
Robbins, Edward Franklin
Robbins, Richard Alan
Robbins, Spencer Everett, II
Roberson, William Henry, III
Roberts, Bruce Alfred
Roberts, Dana Alan

Roberts, Francis Albert
Roberts, John David Frederic
Roberts, Johnny Lee
Roberts, Paul Edward
Roberts, Peter Garety
Roberts, Ralph Dale, Jr.
Roberts, William Stratford
Robertson, Michael Darnell
Robertson, Ronald Leigh
Robey, Richard Ellis, Jr.
Robillard, Ronald Walter
Robinson, Alan Russell
Robinson, Edward Smiley, Jr.
Robinson, John Daniel, Jr.
Robinson, Michael Dean
Robison, Richard Alan
Robitaille, William J.
Roble, Woodrow John
Rocklein, Timothy Arthur
Rockwell, Donald Edward, III
Rockwood, Donald James, Jr.
Rockwood, Sidney Ray
Rodeffer, Ronnie Lee
Roderick, Dennis Patrick
Rodgers, Richard Lee
Rodgers, William Kenneth
Rodman, Wright Noble
Roe, John Allen
Roeber, Dennis Keith
Roed, Carl James
Roeder, John Alexander
Rogers, James Ernest
Rogers, John Daniel
Rogers, Mark Allen
Rogers, Michael William
Rogers, Thomas Wayne
Rogge, John Arthur
Rohlfs, H. Warren, Jr.
Rollings, David Campbell
Roman, Donald A.
Romann, John E
Rome, Gary Bruce
Romito, Vincent Anthony
Ronnie, Scott Craig
Rooke, Harold Norman
Roosa, Roger Keith
Root, Barth James
Root, George Raymond, Jr.
Roper, Daniel Clark
Roper, John Nathaniel, III
Rose, David Owen
Rose, John Michael
Rose, Raymond Parks
Rosecrans, Douglas James
Rosenberg, Jeremy Carter
Ross, Albert James, Jr.
Ross, Jessie Clarence, Jr.
Ross, Jim Allison
Ross, Robert Jay
Ross, Robert Richard
Ross, Stephen Carl
Ross, Walter Lewis, Jr.
Rossbach, Christopher Howard
Rossiter, Alan Wilson
Rossiter, William Kent
Rotzler, Frederic
Roulstone, Donald Bruce
Route, Ronald Arthur
Roux, Jeffrey Andrew
Rowe, Richard Robert
Rowley, Arthur Norman, III
Rowley, Dennis James
Royal, Robert Louis
Rubel, Robert Charles
Rubino, Woody Michael
Rush, William Leech, III
Rucker, David Woodside
Rucker, Joseph Truett
Ruddock, David Hugh
Rudolph, Dieter Klaus
Rundall, David Glen
Runnerstrom, Eric
Ruryk, Mirian Eugene
Rush, James Clifton
Ruskosky, Gale Arnold
Russack, John Alexander
Russell, David Edward
Russell, Donald Franklin
Russell, Houston Roy, Jr.
Russell, Paul Kim
Russell, Robert Wayne
Russell, Thomas Gordon
Ruth, Michael Allan
Rutherford, Allan
Rutkowski, Edwin Gerard
Rutledge, William Craig
Ryan, Dennis Leo, III
Ryan, Franklin Terrence
Ryan, Michael Kevin
Rybinski, Michael
Sabadie, Patrick Alfonso
Sablowski, Michael Robert
Saccio, Edward A.
Sack, Alvin Lee
Sackett, Craig Pinard
Sadler, William Henley, III
Sadowski, Dennis Richard
Sagi, John Phillip
Sakre, Larry Louis
Salemi, Edward Michael
Salinas, Manuel G.
Sallee, Fred Merridith
Salm, Paul Richard
Salter, Jesse Earl
Samar, Jack Joseph, Jr.
Sampson, John Alan
Sams, John Lawrence
Samuel, Gary Bright
Samuels, Arthur Michael
Sanborn, David Lawrence
Sanders, John Russell
Sanders, William Hocutt, Jr.
Sanderson, Robert John
Sandin, Terry Lee
Sandknop, John Benjamin
Sandoz, Patrick Allen
Sands, Jack Harding, Jr.
Sanford, George Samuel, Jr.
Sanford, Leslie McHenry, Jr.
Santangelo, James Angelo
Santoro, Michael Anthony
Saraniero, Michael Anthony
Sassen, Grant William
Sauls, Aubrey Plowden
Saunder, Kenneth Paul
Sauntry, Thomas Fredrick
Saur, Joseph Michael
Sautter, Fredrick Root, Jr.
Savage, Carter Dow
Savage Robert Ray
Savidge, Patrick John
Sax, Karl II
Saxon, Patrick Hurley
Scally, Robert Ernest
Scamihorn, Marvin Ross
Scarbro, Kurt Michael
Schack, Robert Paul
Schaefer, Charles Alfred
Schaefer, Edward Micheal
Schaeffer, Jacob Donald
Schaffer, Lawrence Carl, Jr.
Schall, George Edwin, Jr.
Scharnus, Robert Michael
Schatti, Charles Henry
Schaubel, Raymond Charles
Schaum, Robert Troy
Scheine, Murray
Schellhaas, Richard Begue, Jr.
Schempf, Peter William
Schepman, Dennis Wayne
Scherr, Michael Robert
Schiffelbian, Alexander L.
Schild, William Alfred
Schill, Jerome Edward
Schlichting, Helmuth Carl, Jr.
Schmersal, Christopher John
Schmidt, Alden Duane
Schmidt, Charles Richard
Schmidt, Hubert Francis
Schmidt, Joseph Dunn, Jr.
Schmidt, Robert Eugene
Schmidt, Robert Henry
Schmidt, Robert Stephen
Schmidt, William Richard
Schmiemann, John August
Schneberger, Scott Laurin
Schneider, Anthony Joseph
Schneider, Daniel Henry
Schneider, Leo Joseph, Jr.
Schnellenberger, James Edward
Schnurrpusch, Gary Werner
Schobert, Frederick G., Jr.
Schoonderwoerd, Martin Gene
Schnoonover, Robert Arthur
Schopp, Dean Wesley
Schork, John Forrest
Schoulda, Craig Charles
Schramm, Donald Arthur
Schreiber, Robert Arnold
Schrobo, Stephen Michael
Schrock, Joseph Austin
Schroeder, Milton David
Schroeder, Rodney Clark
Schu, George Marks
Schuknecht, Richard Edward
Schuler, John Joseph
Schutzman, Jay Samuel
Schwab, John Borden
Schwaller, Gregory Anthony
Schwartz, Albert Zalig
Schwartz, Michael Ira
Schwartz, Robert Wendell
Schwenke, George William
Schwier, Edward George
Schwoerer, Barry Frederick
Sciabarra, Joseph Peter
Scofield, Roger Lon
Scott, Dwight Franklin
Scott, Gary Henry
Scott, George Winfield, Jr.
Scott, Gregory Joseph
Scott, Jeff Charles
Scott, John Everett
Scott, Kenneth Henry, Jr.
Scott, Richard Frederick
Scott, Robert Mitchell
Scott, William Nathan, Jr.
Scrapper, John Christopher
Scruggs, Thomas Daniel, Jr.
Scull, John Corson
Scurria, James F.
Sears, James Arthur
Sears, Robert Joseph
Sebastian, Stacy E.
Seckinger, David Neil
Secorsky, Thomas Alan
Seddon, John Alexander, Jr.
Sedgwick, Gordon Lee
Sedun, Peter John
Seeley, John R., Jr.
Seelos, Robert Charles
Seffers, William John
Seiden, John Ben
Selby, Michael Ray
Selde, Peter Jay
Sellers, Ronald Edward
Sellers, William Lester
Semko, Paul Scott
Sentman, Orville Lawrence
Serafine, Gene Clark
Serhan, Marvin Thomas
Seymore, Hubert Elmo, III
Shackelford, Edward Alvin
Shade, Robert James
Shafer, Kenneth Wayne
Shannon, Frank Xavier, III
Shannon, John Timothy
Sharp, Larry Ralph
Sharpe, Bruce Edward
Shatzer, Lewis Allen, Jr.
Shaut, Earl Walter
Shaw, Daniel Nelson
Shaw, David Reginald
Shaw, Samuel Duane
Shaw, William Royal
Shea, Joseph Edward, Jr.
Shean, Keith Ellis
Sheffield, Harold Leo
Shekem, Murat
Shelby, John Daniel
Shelton, Lynn Dale
Shelton, Thomas Leroy
Shepard, Douglas L.

Shepherd, Wilbur French
Shepherd, William Mc Michael
Sheppard, Bruce Edward
Sheppard, Dennis Dean
Sheppard, Walter Timothy
Sheppard, William Lester, Jr.
Sherer, Charles Thaddeus, III
Sherfesee, Louis, III
Sheridan, John Joseph
Sherrange, Daniel Thomas
Sherrard, John Carr
Sherrard, Martin Victor
Sherry, Kevin J.
Shickle, David Lester
Shields, John Thomas, III
Shields, Robert David
Shoaff, Ray Leroy, Jr.
Shockley, William Robert
Shonk, Merwyn Roop
Shook, Richard Millard
Shotts, William Edwin
Shotwell, Henry Lawrence
Showers, Michael James
Shullo, Philip Francis, Jr.
Shultz, John William, III
Shultz, Martin Allen
Shuman, Edward Scott
Shurtz, Don Carlos
Shuster, Don Byron, Jr.
Shutt, Michael David
Shutt, William Leroy
Sides, John Elvin
Sidner, Robert William, Jr.
Sidor, Theodore Lathers
Siedschlag, Daniel Doss
Sieja, Donald Stanley
Siemon, Douglas Henry
Sigler, William Andrew
Sigmon, Kennis Lee
Sikes, Joseph Kelly
Siler, Virgil Robert
Silverman, George Martin
Silvers, Richard Allan
Sim, Richard William
Simmons, David Franklin
Simmons, Edward John
Simmons, John Wallace, II
Simmons, Michael Leroy
Simms, Allan Jay
Simpkins, Earl Lewis, Jr.
Simpson, Charles Davis
Simpson, Robert G.
Sims, Gary Marvin
Sinclair, William Fraser, Jr.
Sine, George William, Jr.
Singleton, Jerry Brian
Sink, Francis Leroy
Sinz, James Patrick
Sipe; Charles Regis, Jr.
Siplia, George William
Siple, Roy Crane
Sisley, William Rice, Jr.
Sitler, Stephen Douglas
Sitz, William Wynn
Sjostrom, Nils Alfred
Skahan, Michael William
Skidmore, Maynard Bliss
Skiles, Rolland Wesley
Skinner, William Edward
Skirm, George Louis III
Skolds, Charles Richard
Skurski, Paul Roy
Slaght, Kenneth Duncan
Slaight, James Butler IV
Slater, Arthur Francis
Slaton, Steven Gregory
Slattery, Patrick John
Slebos, Christian Gerard
Sledge, Loyd Dane
Slein, Michael James
Sloan, Andrew Keith
Slocum, Walter Scott
Slocum, Winfield Scott IV
Slover, William Spencer
Slowik, Robert Louis
Small, Warren Edgar
Smartt, Douglas Arthur
Smiley, Philip Titcomb
Smith, Burton Dunn
Smith, Charles Hughes
Smith, Chester Burton
Smith, Dallas Thomas
Smith, Daniel Earle
Smith, Donald Edward
Smith, Donald W.
Smith, Douglas Vaughn
Smith, Earl Ramon
Smith, Edward Allen, Jr.
Smith, Gary James Ernest
Smith, Gary Lloyd
Smith, Gordon Coleman, II
Smith, Gordon Kenneth
Smith, Harris Latimer
Smith, Jack Robert
Smith, Jeffrey Townsend
Smith, John Vincent, Jr.
Smith, Kenneth Larry
Smith, Kenneth Raymond
Smith, Larry Campbell
Smith, Lawrence Darcy
Smith, Leslie Eugene
Smith, Michael James
Smith, Milton Wayne
Smith, Paul Thomas
Smith, Peter Brooks
Smith, Peter Raymond
Smith, Richard Charles
Smith, Richard Markley
Smith, Robert N.
Smith, Robert William, Jr.
Smith, Roger William
Smith, Stephen Edwin
Smith, Stephen Gary
Smith, Stephen Wayne
Smith, Steven Grayson
Smith, Steven Michael
Smith, Stuart Whitney
Smith, Thomas Earl
Smith, Thomas Michael
Smith, Thomas Phillip
Smith, Thomas William
Smith, Tracy Ray
Smith, William Harold
Smoogen, James Leon
Snell, Dean Allan
Snell, Stephen Farnham
Sniffin, Edward McKim
Snigg, Steven William
Snoddy, Donald Eugene
Snyder, Charles F.
Snyder, Michael Dennis
Snyder, Neil Floyd
Snyder, Thomas Frederick
Sohl, John Herman, III
Sokolo, William Kenneth
Sokolowsky, Simon J.
Solberg, James Lee
Somers, Larry Leroy
Sommers, Sidney Gordon
Soo, Robert Lee
Sorrentino, Ludwig Arthur
Sottile, George Vincent
South, Brian James
Southworth, David Moir
Souza, Philip Eugene, II
Sowa, Edward Stanley, Jr.
Sowa, Phillip Lee
Sowers, Bobby Gene
Sowers, Gary Gilbert
Sowers, James Richard
Spaeth, Warren Theodore, Jr.
Spaulding, Gerald Howard
Spaulding, Robert Parish, Jr.
Speed, William Goodwin, Jr.
Speer, James Walter
Speer, John Paul
Speer, Robert George
Spencer, Charles Henry, Jr.
Sperberg, Lester William, Jr.
Spicer, Virgil A
Spires, Nelson Lee
Spolarich, Martin Michael, Jr.
Sponholz, Richard Otto
Spotts, William Warren
Spratt, Warren Eugene, Jr.
Sprigg, Robert Gary
Springer, Gregory Von
Sprott, Gary J.
Spruiel, Jerry Wayne
Squires, Monte Arthur
Sronce, Frank Thomas
Stables, Thomas Bernarr, III
Staehli, Christopher Paul
Stafford, Robert Harry
Stahl, John, J., III
Stahl, Lawrence Oliver
Staley, Miles Marvin
Stamets, Jon Arthur
Stampe, Lawrence Edward, Jr.
Stanbridge, Harold George
Stanek, David Monroe
Stanek, Francis Jerome
Stanfield, Wesley Craig
Stanford, Michael Lee
Stankoski, John Stephen
Stansel, Michael Jerome
Stansfield, James Daniel, III
Stanton, Bruce Wayne
Stanton, Richard Wayne
Stanton, Thomas Paul
Staples, Ralph Eugene, Jr.
Stark, Richard Robert
Stark, Rodney Lynn
Stark, Terry Michael
Stark, Thomas Alon
Starnes, Charles Newton, Jr.
Starnes, William Heath
Starr, Kenneth Wayne
Startt, Thomas Lee
Stasi, Frank Anthony, Jr.
St.Clair, Kenneth Malcolm, Jr.
Stebbings, Stuart Karl
Stecher, Brian Eugene
Steding, Michael William
Steele, Dean Lee
Steelman, William Jeffrey
Steere, David Campbell
Steffen, David John
Steffens, Thomas William
Stehle, Charles Douglas
Steidle, Craig Eugene
Stein, Eric Andrew
Stenstrom, Frank Ernest
Stentz, Robert Gail
Stephan, Herbert Adam
Stephens, Grant Schneider
Stephens, Hugh Johnson
Stephens, Robert Carroll
Stephenson, James Mell
Stepien, John Zigmand
Steshko, William Nicholas, Jr.
Steussy, James Michael
Steussy, William Howard
Stevens, Ira Boyd
Stevens, Jack Marion, Jr.
Stevens, James Douglas
Stevens, Paul Harold
Stevens, Robert Frederick
Stevens, William Edward
Stevenson, Charles Albert
Steward, Paul Elwyn, Jr.
Stewart, Frank Wood
Stewart, Gordon Grant
Stewart, Hamilton Michael
Stewart, James Robert
Stewart, Richard Kenneth
Stewart, Richard Maxwell
Stewart, William David
Stewart, Wilton Richard
Stieglitz, William Henry
Stine, Emmett W.
Stites, Lloyd Thomas, Jr.
Stockho, William Louis
Stoddard, David Victor
Stoddard, Larry Charles
Stoll, Ralph Heston
Stomboll, James Ralph
Stone, Daniel Joseph
Stone, James Benjamin, Jr.
Stone, John Lloyd
Stone, Timothy Gene
Stoner, Donald Winston
Storer, David Gene

Storez, Robert Alfred
Storm, Gary Alan
Storr, Otto
Story, Alfred Douglas
Stow, Richard Loomis
Strain, Hugh Joseph
Strait, Chester Edwin
Stratton, James William
Stratton, Larry Rodger
Strausbaugh, Wayne Lee
Strauss, John Howard
Strawn, Gary William
Strickland, Edward, IV
Strickland, Lerory Hickman
Strickland, Peter Benham
Strohofer, Clifford John, Jr.
Stromquist, David William
Stroop, Patrick Allen
Strother, Dennis Edward
Struble, James Franklin
Stuart, Michael Frank
Stuart, Robert William
Stubblefied, Gary Leslie
Stubs, Gary Winterson
Stuck, James Roland
Stuckert, Bruce Taylor
Stuermann, Walter Peter
Stuhlman, Robert Harold
Stull, Mark Judson
Stutler, Frank Otley, Jr.
Subalusky, William Thomas, Jr.
Suberly, Roy Herbert, Jr.
Suggs, Ralph Edward
Suhr, James William
Sujdak, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Suldo, Michael Richard
Sullivan, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Sullivan, Edward Lawrence
Sullivan, John Donald
Sullivan, Kerry Jay
Sullivan, Larry Michael
Sullivan, Patrick Dennis
Sullivan, Paul Francis
Sullivan, William Joseph
Suman, Steven Michael
Summerlin, Michael Don
Sundin, Melvin Leroy
Sutter, Ellis Dee, III
Sutton, Harry Warren
Sutton, William Glenn
Svec, James Hynek
Swafford, Thomas Lee
Swain, Philip Frank
Swan, David Arthur
Swanson, Eldon Carl, Jr.
Swanson, Raymond Peter
Swartz, Edward Lee
Swartz, Lowell Franklin
Sweeney, Orval Lester
Sweet, James Franklin
Sweetman, James Michael
Swenson, Carl Frederick
Swift, David Allen
Sykes, William George
Szemborski, Stanley Robert
Tabing, Mark Dana
Tackett, Kevin James
Taggart, John Laughlin, Jr.
Tait, William Allan
Talipsky, Richard William
Talton, George Marshal, III
Tamulevich, Carl Joseph
Tande, Ludvig Kris
Tankersley, Carl Mark
Taplett, Kenneth John
Tarantino, Paul Salvatore
Tate, Russell Eric
Taul, Gary Dee
Taylor, Arch Edward
Taylor, Charley Joe
Taylor, Donald Walter
Taylor, James Earl
Taylor, James Edward
Taylor, Joseph E.
Taylor, Lee Bradford
Taylor, Richard Ford
Taylor, Robert Eugene
Taylor, Ronald Dan
Taylor, Ronald Maurice
Taylor, Russell Maxfield, II
Taylor, Samuel Walter
Tea, Max Ralph
Teetz, William Richard
Tehan, Terrence Norbert
Teillon, Lance William
Tempel, Billie Leon
Tennant, John William
Terlizzi, Thomas Paul
Terrell, Lyndon Travis
Terrell, Mark Richard
Tetlow, Philip Christopher
Tetlow, Thomas George
Tettelbach, Gary John
Teves, Arthur Gregory
Thacker, Reginald Allen
Thacker, Richard Leighton
Thaggard, Robert Stephen, Jr.
Thalman, David Marvin
Thames, Charles Melvin
Therrell, Thomas Stephen
Therrien, Alfred E.
Thies, Denzil Delane
Thomas, David William
Thomas, Donald Ralphael
Thomas, Francis Farrell
Thomas, George Guy
Thomas, H. Clay, III
Thomas, Harry Fannin
Thomas, Jon Marc
Thomas, Joseph Walter
Thomas, Mark Alan
Thomas, Michael Charles
Thomas, Raymond Edgar
Thomas, Robert Michael
Thomas, Roger N.
Thomas, Scott Shingle
Thomas, William Curtis
Thomason, William Rex
Thompson, Alan Jeffrey
Thompson, Charles Douglas
Thompson, Charles Edward
Thompson, Clarence Elmer
Thompson, Douglas Scott
Thompson, Gary Robert
Thompson, George Albert
Thompson, James Jay
Thompson, Jerry Dennis
Thompson, John Anton
Thompson, John Richard
Thompson, Thomas Louis, Jr.
Thomsen, Leon Fredric
Thomson, David Duerr
Thorgerson, Arne Raymond
Thorkilson, Howard Neri
Thorne, Larry Martin
Thornton, James Terry
Thorpe, Lloyd Allen
Thorsen, Timothy Lee
Thurman, Alan Barton
Tiedeman, George Ralph
Tierney, Glenn Patrick
Tilden, Averill Edward
Tillotson, Kenneth Delmer
Timberlake, William Archer
Timmester, Terry Wayne
Timms, Terry Wayne
Tinsley, Steven Garland
Tippett, Terry Lee
Tipps, Richard Douglas
Tipsword, William Harold, Jr.
Tirrell, William Barclay
Tobia, John A.
Todd, James M.
Todd, William Thomas
Tody, Stephen Lee
Toennies, Peter Ewald
Tolhurst, Robert Alfred, Jr.
Tollefson, Michael Rolf
Tomanelli, James Rocco
Tomlinson, Jack Evans
Tomlinson, Phillip Franklin
Toney, James H.
Tosatto, Francis Levern
Towcimak, William Robert, Jr.
Tower, Dennis Ray
Towners, John Willie, III
Townsend, Ronald David
Trainor, William Gerald
Trapp, Arthur K.
Traughber, Thomas Patrick
Travis, Thomas Lee
Treadway, Alton Glen
Trethewey, Thomas George
Tribelhorn, Ronald Wayne
Tripp, Robert Elwood
Trudell, Michael Albert
Trudell, Thomas Alfred
Truitt, Benjamin
Trytten, Dean Orville
Tucker, Charles Wayne
Tucker, Richard Steven
Tuggle, Richard H.
Tulchin, Benjamin David
Tull, Carl Ashby
Turk, Joseph
Turnbull, Steven Scott
Turner, Archie Andrew, III
Turner, Donald P.
Turner, Douglas Kearney
Turner, Elder Dale
Turner, Jack Eugene
Turner, James Sunday, Jr.
Turner, Jay Ellery
Turner, Ronald David
Turner, Steven Robert
Turner, Terry Lee
Turriff, David James
Turunen, Robert Louis
Turville, William Charles, Jr.
Tuttle, Larry Jerome
Tyler, Julian Woodworth, III
Tyler, Robert Jeffrey
Tyler, Warner Russell
Uhlenkott, Gary Wynne
Ulaszewski, Terence Jerome
Ulrich, Henry George, III
Umbarger, Ray McKenna
Underwood, Jefferson Gordon
Underwood, Van Douglas
Uplinger, Joseph Charles
Usis, Felix Max, III
Utegaard, Thomas Eric
Utermohlen, Frank Henry
Utsch, Frank Robert
Utschig, Thomas John
Utterback, Robert Alan
Uttich, Richard Michael
Vanasdlen, David Lester
Vanbrocklin, Stephen Ted
Vanbrunt, Tommy Harris
Vanbuskirk, Dennis James
Vance, Thomas Coates
Vance, William Donald
Vandeman, Frank Leslie, IV
Vanderberg, Mark Tompkins
Vandevender, John Archie
Vandover, David Lee
Vanhorn, Gary Roy
Vanhoy, William Allen
Vantassel, Paul Franklin
Vanvlack, Charles Henry
Vanwie, Steven Leroy
Varley, John Charles
Vassar, William Lee
Vaughan, Steven Andrew
Vaurio, David G.
Vehorn, Roger Paul
Veldstra, Daniel Roy
Veltman, Richard James
Venable, Ted Jeffrey
Verbrugge, Kenneth Ervin
Vershish, Robert J.
Vertovec, Frank James, Jr.
Vettese, Anthony
Vice, Larry Wayne
Vick, Paul Steven
Viglienzone, Dennis Edward
Villarosa, John Poteat
Vincelette, Paul Louis
Vinson, Robert K.
Violette, Richard Gary
Visco, Dominick Wayne
Vittum, David Arthur

Vivoli, John Bernard
Vogel, Paul H.
Voss, Philip Dane
Vosseler, Paul Kurt Alfred
Vosseteig, Craig Eugene
Vtipil, Donald Sheridan
Waddell, James Barry
Waddell, John William
Wade, Jack Merle
Wade, Phillip Morris
Wadington, Clair Allen
Wagemaker, Wallace James
Wagner, Cort Davis
Wagner, David John
Wagner, Randall Douglas
Wagner, William Joseph
Wagoner, Robert Charles
Wais, Richard Joseph
Waite, Lynn Lewis
Wakefield, Stanley Irvin
Wakeman, Mark
Waldbeesser, Terry Wayne
Walker, David Lee
Walker, Donald Beach
Walker, Frank Thomas, Jr.
Walker, John Bruce
Walker, Ronnie Eugene
Wall, Allan David
Wall, John Russell
Wall, Laurence Llewellyn
Wallace, David Kitts
Wallace, David William
Wallace, Donald Stephan
Wallace, Edward Charles
Wallace, James Young, III
Wallace, Ray Anderson
Wallfred, James Gordon
Walsh, John Patrick, Jr.
Walsh, Neil Patrick
Walsh, Thomas Munroe
Walters, Gary Allan
Walters, John Justin
Walters, Lynford Stetson, III
Walters, Ronald Wayne
Walton, Jerry Eugene
Wanner, Terry Scott
Warburton, Frederick, T. Jr.
Ward, Charles Raymond
Ward, Clement Harry
Ward, James Gearey
Wargo, Joseph William
Warner, Thomas George
Warren, David Franklin
Warren, Floyd Dewey, Jr.
Warren, John Willard
Washer, William Lee
Wassel, Ronald Andrew
Waterman, Bradford Bates, III
Waterman, Ralph John
Waters, Lance Arthur
Watkins, John Bruce
Watkins, William Allen
Watson, Anthony John
Watson, Chester Arthur, Jr.
Watson, Jerry Carthal
Watson, John Robert
Watson, Michael James
Watt, Alexander Young, Jr.
Watters, Paul Andrew
Watts, Harry Franklin, Jr.
Weatherington, Michael Wayn
Weaver, Charles Shepard
Weaver, Christopher Edward
Weaver, Sterrie Leon, Jr.
Webb, Richard Allan
Webber, Thomas Charles
Weber, Charles Lawrence, Jr.
Weber, Robin York
Weber, Ronald Bailey
Weber, William Lloyd, III
Weborg, Gene Marvin
Wedding, Gregory Louis
Weeks, Stanley Byron
Wegrzyn, Raymond Robert
Weik, Thomas Anthony
Wein, Michael Clark
Weir, Michael William
Weisberg, Neal William
Weiscopf, Carl Eugene
Weiss, Christopher Lee
Weiss, Donald Alan
Weiss, Douglas Lee
Welch, Daniel Roy
Weldon, William Arden
Weller, Ronald Edward
Weller, Wayne Leroy
Welling, David Craig
Wellman, William Earl
Wells, John Timothy
Wells, Robert Runkle
Welsh, Edward Joseph, III
Welsh, Harold Kenneth, Jr.
Welsh, Patrick Timothy
Welter, George Alexander
Welterlen, Craig Robert
Wendling, Joseph Allen
Wengierski, Irwin T.
Werling, Robert
Wetz, Bruce Neal
Wesselhoff, Stephen Thomas
Wessman, Mark Donald
West, Michael Christopher
Westbrook, Gary Michael
Westcott, Richard Elliott
Westmoreland, William Donald
Westray, Richard Howard
Whaley, Glenn Richard
Whall, David Gerald
Wharton, Darryl Matthew
Wheat, Luther William
Wheeler, Richard Carter
Whiddon, William David
Whilden, Francis Covington
Whitaker, Charles Henry, Jr.
Whitco, Denis John
White, Bradley Thomas
White, Harold Kent
White, James Bryan
White, John Stanton
White, Joseph Michael
White, Nestor Dorian
White, Paul Marvin
White, Phillip Joseph
White, Robert Downie
White, Robert Eugene, Jr.
White, Thomas Willard
Whitelatch, Robert Clinton
Whiteway, Roger Newell
Whitford, Daniel Lee
Whiting, Geoffrey Alan
Whitmire, Dewey Laland
Whitney, Darrell Emerson
Whitney, David Michael
Whitney, John Douglas
Whiton, Harry Winsor
Whitt, David F.
Whittle, Alfred James, III
Wick, Carl Eric
Wicklander, Edwin Richard, Jr.
Widhalm, Kenneth Charles
Wies, David Scott
Wiggins, Bryan Douglas, Jr.
Wiggins, Ronald Luther, Jr.
Wight, Terry Michael
Wilbricht, Thomas Edward
Wilcox, Ronald James
Wild, William, John, Jr.
Wildermuth, Ronald Everett
Wile, Ted Shannon
Wiley, Ronald Allen
Wilhelm, John Raymond, Jr.
Wilhelm, Richard Jay
Wilkins, Bruce Alan
Wilkins, Thomas William
Willenbrock, Eric Frederick
Willey, James Fletcher
Williams, Bruce Arnold
Williams, Charles Baxter
Williams, David Morgan
Williams, Donald Grant, Jr.
Williams, Douglas Henry
Williams, Galbraith Denny, Jr.
Williams, Gary Eugene
Williams, Harold Aldrich
Williams, James Michael
Williams, John Charles
Williams, John Forrest
Williams, Kenneth Lynn
Williams, Marcus Samuel
Williams, Michael L.
Williams, Pharis Edward
Williams, Robert Frank
Williams, Robert G.
Williams, Robert Jay
Williams, Robert Ralph
Williams, Thomas Cloud, Jr.
Williams, Thomas Yeaman
Williams, Wallace B.
Williams, William Robert
Williamson, Paul Byers
Willis, Thurman Lamar
Wilmoth, James Walter
Wilson, Bryan Paul
Wilson, Charles Howard
Wilson, Eric Thomson
Wilson, Geoffrey Peter
Wilson, George Michael
Wilson, Herbert Michael
Wilson, James Allen
Wilson, Jay Ronal
Wilson, Philip Barry
Wilson, Robert Lewis, Jr.
Wilson, Steven Dale
Wilson, Thomas Ray
Wilt, Thornton Willard, Jr,
Wiltzius, Lawrence N., Jr.
Winchell, Donald Lind, Jr.
Windeguth, Richard Baxter
Winkler, Michael Frederick
Winsted, Bradley Yancey
Winter, Dennis Allan
Winter, John Herman
Winters, Keith Allen
Wise, John Roy
Witherspoon, Lewis James
Witkowski, Christopher J.
Wittkamp, Thomas Michael
Wittmann, William Warren
Wnek, Francis Mitchell
Wolfe, Charles Darwin
Wolfe, Robert James
Wolfe, Wayne Leonard
Wolking, Fred Louis
Woltman, Ronald Richard
Wolven, Bruce Alan
Wolverton, Gilbert Leroy
Womack, Lee Thell, Jr.
Wood, Don Alan
Wood, Gregory James
Wood, Larry Ronald
Wood, Robert Allen, Jr.
Wood, Scott Allen
Wood, William Bob, Jr.
Woodfill, William Dale
Woodford, Joseph Philip
Woodman, William Douglas
Woods, Larry Joe
Woodworth, Richard Alden
Woolard, Reginald Wallace, II
Wooldridge, Gregory Carroll
Woomer, Charles Wesley, III
Wooten, Charles Edwin
Word, Ross Alan
Worley, Michael Jesse
Worms, Brent Leslie
Wright, Garry Edward
Wright, Herbert Rawson, III
Wright, Jay Lee
Wright, John Thomas
Wright, Jon Robert
Wright, Richard Francis
Wright, Sherman E., Jr.
Wright, Thomas Baxter, Jr.
Wright, Wilbur Grant
Wright, William Edwin
Wrobel, Richard August
Wunsch, Charles Steven
Wurtzbacher, Henry Todd
Wyatt, Randall Edward
Wyckoff, George Thomas
Wyckoff, William Watson, II
Wyld, Thomas Clinton
Wylie, George Joseph

Wylie, James Meredith, Jr.
Wynne, Harold Bradford
Xefteris, Constantine Louis
Yankolonis, Barry Lee
Yates, Alan Walker
Yeager, James Hugh
Yeatman, Lawrence Lankford
Yee, Thomas Hop
Yesensky, Douglas Alan
Yetsko, Joseph Franklin
Yonce, William Scott
York, William Joe
Young, Charles Bruce
Young, David Keith
Young, Gerald Alan
Young, James Albert
Young, John Robert
Young, Kerry Alan
Young, Richard Andrew
Young, William David
Young, William Karl
Youngblood, David Ray, Jr.
Youngman, Kenneth Ray, Jr.
Yount, George Richard
Yount, Richart Fulton
Yunker, John Michael
Zackary, Fort Arthur, Jr.
Zajicek, Richard Gene
Zakem, Jeffrey Steven
Zambernardi, Paul Anthony
Zavadil, John Leslie
Zavadil, Stephen Wayne
Zeitler, George Dean
Zell, William Beigler, Jr.
Zerbian, David Alan
Zia, Ralph Khan
Zielinski, Leon John
Ziemer, Robert Timothy
Zinser, Harry Jack
Zitzelman, Philip Wayne
Zorbach, Gregory Michael
Zukowski, Walter Charles
Zullinger, Charles F. III
Zuniga, Fred Joseph
Zysk, Thomas Stephen

MEDICAL CORPS

Adams, Michael L.
Allred, Thomas J.
Aulicino, Pat L.
Baez, Ramon Edmundo, Jr.
Bass, Robert Redwood
Benton, Philip C.
Brown, Mark Vincent
Bryarly, Richard C., Jr.
Buckley, Robert Leslie
Caldwell, Robert L.
Coddington, Charles C., III
Collier, William E., Jr.
Collins, Thomas M.
Colonsoto, Benito
Cook, Timothy Garman
Davis, Mark Stuart
Dudley, Albert H., III
DuFour, David Robert
Eninger, Larry A.
Farrell, George Joseph, III
Fontaine, David J.
Francheschi, Zambrana Jorge
Galentine, Paul Guy, III
Gehret, Richard George
Gilmore, Dennis Marvin
Hastay, Peter Chandler
Hayes, Arthur Commons
Herr, Celeste E.
Hilder, Richard J., Jr.
Ho, Ju Chang
Hoover, Lewis D.
Hurst, David B.
Isaac, Felix
Johnson, Larry Hugh
Klatt, Richard W.
Kosh, David Lawrence
Larocque, James C.
Ledbetter, Elizabeth K. L.
Little, Michael Jackson
Long, Kenneth William
Lonon, William Delmar, Jr.
Lovan, Wendell D.
Manansala, Francisco S.
Masys, Daniel R.
McCall, Mark Jeffrey
Mikell, Oswald Lightsey
Miller, Michael L.
Montgomery, Thomas Robert
Navarro, Francisco Rosal, Jr.
North, Robert B., Jr.
Parina, Bernardo Borromeo
Patel, Dilip D.
Perez, Romeo Pozon
Potter, Bonnie Burnham
Pratt, Randall N., Jr.
Pratt, Steven George
Pringle, Joseph Ross, Jr.
Puder, Robert David
Racicot, David F.
Ramos, Huberto Issac
Rorick, Jay Thompson, Jr.
Ruel, Theodore Arthur
Ryan, Mark
Sainten, Carl B.
Scott, William, Jr.
Seaquist, Mark B.
Shale, John H.
Shelby, John Harry
Skye, Harry William
Smith, John Connor
Swink, Lawrence R.
Taylor, John Kenyon
Thompson, Douglas Franklin
Tomlin, Thomas Allen
Voit, Marek Stanislaw
Wade, Lloyd Robert, Jr.
Walsh, Michael F.
Ward, Christopher H.
Wedul, Mark Vernon
Wilberg, Carl W.
Wilson, Michael Shannon
Yang, William N.
Yowell, Steven K.
Zaide, Amanda C.

SUPPLY CORPS

Aaronson, Brian David
Achenbaugh, Dennis Allen
Adams, Roy Stila, Jr.
Allen, Randall C.
Allion, Dennis G.
Allison, Robert Clement
Ames, Hugh Douglas, III
Anastasi, Richard
Andrew, Michael Raymond
Angelopoulos, Gary John
Appleby, Michael Ralph
Archer, Raymond Aubrey, III
Arcuri, Louis Edward
Argento, Terry James
Arllen, Eric Arthur
Asselin, Andre Sylvio
Avery, James Alan
Bailey, John Roger
Ball, Edgar Scott, Jr.
Banghart, Allan Andrew
Barnes, Jerry D.
Bassi, Felix Joseph
Basso, Joseph Michael
Beaty, Richard Moore
Becker, Christopher Santana
Bender, Danny Arthur
Benecke, Jay Robert Orrin
Benefiel, William Philip
Bennett, Bruce Robert
Bennett, Robert Danny
Benson, Linwood Earl
Berg, Roland Douglas
Bianco, Barron Bruce
Bidwell, Robert Roy
Bird, Robert Ralph
Blood, Roger Ralph
Boas, Raymond A.
Bobulinski, Robert Alexander
Boecchino, David Louis
Bogart, James McNary
Bohannon, Donald Clyde
Bollman, Terry Lee
Bonafede, James Michael
Bonna, Ralph Anthony
Branaman, Larry Gene
Brawley, Patrick William
Bredemann, David Lee
Bristol, Roger Willis
Brooks, Ted Edward
Brown, Phil Jay
Buchleiter, Charles R.
Burdon, William Henry
Burgess, Andrew Plumer, III
Burgess, Roy H.
Burton, Robert Norman, Jr.
Buteau, Paul James
Callaway, Michael Patrick
Camp, Gary Lee
Camp, Robert Thomas
Capizzi, David Alan
Carbone, James, Jr.
Carl, David Eugene
Carney, David G.
Carpenter, Levon Henry
Carroll, Joseph David
Casey, Michael Wayne
Cass, Leland Hooker, Jr.
Chambers, Thomas Ralph
Chandler, Brian J.
Chase, Kenneth Ray
Chitty, Frederick Cole
Clark, James Matthew
Cogswell, Peter M. L.
Cohen, Jay Martin
Coker, James Edward
Coker, Norman Loren
Cole, Anthony Livingston
Colvin, Bruce Arnold
Compton, David Dean
Conner, James Raymond
Conner, Terrence A.
Conover, Richard Philip
Cook, David Michael
Cooper, Raiford Wilson, Jr.
Cormier, Edward Norris, Jr.
Cornelison, Gary Alan
Cote, James R.
Crandall, Stephen Gary
Croll, John Michael
Cunningham, Victor E.
Daniels, David Longsworth
Dase, James Robert
Dashiell, Robert George
Davenport, Bill Trammell, Jr.
Davis, Peter McCoy
Dewell, Kenneth George
Dickey, Donald William
DiFranco, Steven Joseph
Dolan, Kevin Christopher
Dorries, Robert A.
Doyle, Joseph Drew
Drum, Eugene Robert
Duffey, Thomas Owen
Dunn, Christopher Anderson
Dupree, Daniel Myron
Durnan, Robert Emmett
Easton, Frederick Bigelow
Elder, Jeffrey John
Elgin, Richard
Emerson, Jimmie Darrell
Engel, Steven Ray
Engelmann, Robert Ardo
Ensminger, David Scott
Evans, Michael W.
Ewing, Richard Andrew
Fackenthall, William Gordon
Fages, Sheldon Neil
Fantroy, Ward Keith
Faubell, Paul David
Faucher, David Paul
Faurie, Bruce Roger
Featherstone, Harry Lee, Jr.
Felts, Warren T.
Finefrock, Carl George
Flahiff, Daniel Edward
Flanagan, John Edward, Jr.
Flohr, Larry Eugene
Foley, Robert Patrick
Forde, Duane L.
Forney, Robert Allen

Fremont, Robert Francis, III
Frial, Ernesto Fabillon
Fuller, Dana Adelferd, Jr.
Fulton, Terry Alan
Gallitz, Ronald James
Gandola, Kenneth Davidson
Gannon, Thomas Curtis
Gedney, John Warren
Gernentz, Thomas Joseph
Gianfagna, William Louis
Gibbons, Lawrence Brady
Gibbs, David Michael
Gilbert, Robert Roy
Gillespie, Daniel Doherty
Ginman, Richard Taylor
Giordano, Donald Michael
Gonick, Timothy James
Gorman, Howard Paul, Jr.
Goss, Ardin Francis
Gould, Jeffrey Paul
Graf, Albert John, III
Granston, Jeffrey Robert
Grant, Charles Wayne
Gray, David Bert
Greenberg, Joel Michael
Gregory, Troy Richard
Griffin, James Howard, III
Griffin, Roland Lewis
Griggs, William Clifton
Griswold, Raymond Bruce
Gross, Thomas D.
Guerard, Franklin Palmer
Gulliford, Steven R.
Gunderson, Richard Howard
Gunter, Wallace Eugene, Jr.
Gustafson, Robert Andrew
Guyer, Dean Chris
Hall, Richard Patton
Hammons, Thomas Joel, III
Hankins, Stanley E.
Hannaford, Philip Stephen
Hanson, Ryan Lewis
Harder, Larry D.
Hargrave, Bevard Eugene
Hargrove, James Wiley, Jr.
Harr, David James
Harris, Craig Steven
Harris, Robert Earl
Hartman, John Molyneux
Haskett, William Blair, III
Hastings, Richard G., III
Hawkins, Paul Russell
Hawxhurst, Jack Michael
Hayes, Edward Francis, Jr.
Hayes, John Robert, Jr.
Heikkila, James L.
Hein, Jonathan Jacques
Helgerson, Philip Arthur
Hempson, Donald A., Jr.
Henke, Louis, III
Henning, Robert Allen
Herbst, Howard Paul
Hertstein, Mark Sherman
Hetherington, Jerry Francis
Hickman, Ronald William
Hickman, William Allen
Hickson, Edward Earl
Higgins, Thomas Patrick, Jr.
Hill, Ronald L.
Hinkel, Shelby, Jr.
Hinson, Kenneth Earl
Hodges, James V.
Hodgkins, Henry Adelbert, Jr.
Hoffman, Thomas Lewis
Hofmann, Arnold Robert
Holback, James Henry
Holcombe, James Othol
Holland, Benjamin A.
Hooth, Michael Douglas
Hornyak, Edward Joseph
Horstman, Donald Martin
Howdyshell, Robert J.
Hrabosky, Bryan, Jr.
Huban, George Hambre, Jr.
Huddleston, Ronald Duane
Hudock, Steven Adam
Huss, Boyce Wayne
Inouye, Clinton Wayne
Ippel, Terry Alan
Ison, George Stephen
Jackson, John Edward
Jackson, William Andrew
Jenkins, Gwilym Howard, Jr.
Johnson, Delmont Scott
Johnson, Jay Carter
Johnson, Mark Rich
Johnson, Mark Scott
Johnson, Ronald Toivo
Johnson, Terrence Bateman
Johnson, William Earl
Jones, David Carrick, III
Jones, Joseph Matthew, Jr.
Jones, Samuel Lynn
Joslin, Richard Morten
June, Michael Anthony
Kalapos, Michael Lee
Kaloupek, William Thomas
Karns, Larry Neil
Kaufmán, Gary Raymond
Keating, Charles Lewis
Keller, David Paul
Kelley, Joseph Paul
Kelley, Kevin Paul
Kelley, Daniel Charles
Kennedy, Harvey Lee
Kesselring, Steven Dale
Ketts, Robert Lee
Kiefer, Roy William
Kimball, Daniel Webster
King, Wallace Vernon
Kline, Jack Charles
Kline, Richard W.
Knight, Robert Clark, Jr.
Knight, Walter Curry
Kosar, Peter George
Kramer, Keith Stewart
Krogh, Leslie Allen
Krupp, Robert John
Lambert, John Robert
Landerkin, Edward Joseph
Larmee, Donald Henry, Jr.
Lawrence, Robert Craig
Lengkeek, Dale R.
Leon, John Anthony, Jr.
Leonard, Robert Paul
Lewis, Albert Michael
Lewis, Richard E.
Lindsey, Larry Allen
Lippert, Keith Wayne
Low, David Herman Jean
Lowe, Richard Carroll
Machado, Bruce Mervin
Madaio, Paul Frank
Main, Archibald MacNicoll,III
Malcolm, Nathaniel D., Jr.
Malone, John Murray
Malsack, Thomas James
Manley, Stewary Lee
Mansfield, David Kay
Marchetti, Ronald Andrew
Marques, Ernest B.,II
Martinec, Dennis Paul
Mathews, Mayes David
Matsushima, Rodney Fujio
Matthews, John Craig
McCarthy, Justin D.
McClain, John Franklin, III
McCoy, Rex Calvin
McCray, James Elburn, II
McCulloch, John William
McDowell, Tommy Gene
McGee, Gary Owen
McKeithan, Timothy Shepard
McKenzie, Donald Richard, Jr.
McQueen, Thomas Walter
McWherter, Marvin Eugene
Meeker, Richard Stratton
Menendez Ernest Marco, Jr.
Mercier, Kevin Gerard
Mercogliano, Anthony
Merrell, Thomas Orin
Merritt, Karl William
Miller, Felton
Miller, Michael James
Miller, Raymond Lee
Miller, Thomas G.
Minton, David Scott
Mitchell, Colonus, Jr.
Mitchell, Kent Ryan
Mitchell, Lonsdale Clifford
Moessner, Frederick William
Moffitt, Michael Allan
Monaco, Robert Edmund
Moore, James Berry
Moore, Joseph Nichols
Moore, Robert Tolmie, III
Moran, Michael Dann
Morrisey Daniel Patrick
Murff, Bruce Wells
Neeb, John Gilcher
Nemeth, John William
Nichols, James Stuart, Jr.
Nogosek, John
Nyland, Stephen Carel
Ohagan, Michael George
Oreilly, Patrick J.
Owen, Wayne Allen
Palanuk, Joseph L.
Parham, James Luis
Parker, Kenneth Lloyd
Parry, Dennis S.
Pathwickpaszyc, John Conrad
Payne, David Daulton
Payne, Harold R.
Pearce, Richard Leeroy
Pearrell, Larry William
Pendarvis, Daniel III
Perkins, Charles Alan
Perkins, George Warren Jr.
Perry, Keith Michael
Petersen, Gary Roy
Peterson, Carl Raymond Jr.
Pettersen, Alan John
Phoenix, Edward Arthur
Pingel, Richard Douglas
Pitkin, Richard Cochran
Pledger, John David
Pointer, Billy Ray
Polley, John E.
Poole, Francis Xavier
Proctor, Leonard Lewis
Purdy, Kenneth C.
Rawlings, David Grant
Reed, Ernest Thompson
Reed, Ronald Passmore
Reese, James Mackintosh
Reeve, Robert Eugene
Renard, Geoffrey Kent
Rich, Bruce Bailey
Rich, Lyle Vernon
Riege, Duane J.
Rieve, Roy Chandler
Rigg, David L.
Rinaldo, John Charles
Ritter, Ronald Keith
Ritzel, Charles James
Rivers, Charles Silas, Jr.
Roach, Leonard Thomas
Robertson, James Miller, III
Robertson, Jimmy Wayne
Rodenbarger, Syd W.
Rogers, Robert William
Roper, Darcy Wentworth, III
Rorex, Thomas Arthur
Rossi, Philip Roger
Roundtree, Ronald Terrance
Rova, Bruce Wayne
Royer, Frank Edward
Rutledge, Michael Robert
Ryan, Robert Joseph
Sager, Christopher Parke
Sanford, Robert Michael
Sargent, William H.
Sauer, George Emery, III
Schaedel, John Gordon
Schildwachter, Martin Joseph
Schimpf, Barry John
Schlax, Thomas Patrick
Schmidt, William George
Schmitt, Michael Kennedy
Schmitt, Nicholas Joseph
Schneider, Jeffery William
Schreiber, Thomas Joseph

Schrum, Richard Ward
Scudder, Stephen Lee
Self, James Joseph
Sellers, Benjamin Russell
Shapack, Arnold Robert
Shepherd, Robert Myrick, Jr.
Shiffman, Robert Lawrence
Shoemaker, Charles Kenneth
Shubert, Tommy Lawrence
Siegel, Allen Ray
Siemers, Uwe
Simmons, John Richard
Sims, Donald Booth, Jr.
Smith, Emmett Wilson
Smith, Raymond William
Smith, Stephan L.
Soderberg, Paul Oscar
Stallman, Donald Jacob
Standen, Eric Allen
Stanger, Thomas Joseph
Steigelman, Anthony Edward
Stephens, Edward Neil
Stewart Edmund H., Jr.
Stilwell, Robert Redmond
Stone, Daniel Herman
Straight, Ronald Lee
Sugermeyer, Robert Storck
Sugihara, Ronald Yuzuru
Sule, Michael Francis
Sullivan, Reed Alvord
Sweney, Robert Lee
Tarleton, George Lester, III
Tarver, James Edward
Taylor, Charles Floyd, Jr.
Theiss, Girard Paul
Thornton, Robert Gregory
Thorpe, Grant William
Tinker, William Marshall
Tissier, Robert Joseph
Todd, Dale Edward
Tufts, John Emory
Turpie, James Alastair G.
Valentine, Stephen, IV
Vanauken, Pierce Richard, Jr.
Vanderslice, Wayne James
Vanhorn, Roy Dudley
Vellis, John Demetrius, II
Verbic, Alan Robert
Vinagre, Eduardo Gerardo
Vinson, Charles Mays
Vogelsang, James Edwin
Waldrop, Charles Pike
Walker, Allan Warren
Walsh, Robert Arthur, II
Walters, James Stephen
Walters, Melville Joseph, III
Ward, Paul David
Watkinson, Lyle Patrick
Weidemann, James Lee
Welch, Benjamin Harrison, III
Wenchel, George Frederic
Wenslaff, William Arthur
Wertmuller, Roy Walter
Weyrick, Philip Frederick
White, Charles Elbridge
White, Richard Stuart
Wieczorek, Richard Joseph
Wilhite, Bernard Lee
Willis, Roger Allen
Wilson, Paul Abernathy
Wilund, William Patrick
Wimett, William Thomas
Wood, Robert Harding, II
Woods, Willie Edward
Woodward, George Gage, Jr.
Worrall, Eric Hamilton
Wright, Dennis Lloyd
Wurzel, Thomas Eugene
Yates, David Stephen
Young, Charles K.
Younker, Michael Elwood
Yount, Mark Lee
Zawadzki, Raymond Stanley
Zehner, Dale J.
Zeiler, Robert William, III
Zurinski, Donald John
Zychowski, Thaddeus Frank

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Barsch, Robert Ignatius
Blasich, Bernard
Blegstad, Gary Conrad
Brogan, Leo Thomas
Brookshire, Joseph William
Bruce, Gerald Ronald
Burke, Ronald John
Burnett, Ivan Blackwell, Jr.
Chadwick, Thomas K.
Cluff, Merlin Henry
Colton, Alan Frank
Condon, Edwin Daniel, Jr.
Condon, William Gerard
Cragun, Gary James
Craycraft, John David
Delong, Stanley W.
Dickerson, Jerry Lee
Dieckhaus, Anthony William
Dubose, Thomas Jefferson Z.
Duncan, Charles R.
Egan, John Joseph
Eis, Charles Richard
Ellison, Floyd C.
Ferguson, Melvin Ray
Fernandez, Jose L.
Fitch, William B.
Fitzgerald, John Louis
Flick, Richard H.
Fryer, Patrick L.
Gardner, Ronald Earl
Gibson, William H.
Gilbert, Leroy
Giuntoli, Thomas Gino
Greve, Lionel
Grogan, Gerald Robert
Gundlach, John F., III
Ha Young, Chang
Halley, Michael D.
Heitschmidt, Douglas Gregg
Hendricks, Clare Joseph
Herndon, James Nelson
Heslop, Thomas Charles
Hill, Robert Selden, Jr.
Holland, David J.
Izac, Carroll Andre
Jayne, Bruce C.
Jensen, Steven L.
Jukam, Donald C.
Julius, James Anthony
Kemper, John Edmond
Kennedy, Michael H.
Kimokeo, Samuel August
Kincl, Robert L.
Knitter, Carl Ludwig, III
Langhorne, George A.
Livojevich, Ronald
Manning, Robert John
Masse, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Mattie, Richard Michael
McAdoo, Larry W.
McCranie, Glenn H.
McCreary, Stanley Howard
Natkin, Fred Arthur
Pace, Roger W.
Palmer, Harold D.
Passero, Ernest Felice
Pearcy, David L.
Perry, Eugene E.
Pierce, Roger Wayne
Pokladowski, Gregory S.
Rector, Larry J.
Rector, Roscoe E., Jr.
Salas, Jose Felix, Jr.
Saunders, John Price
Sharpe, Jack Larry
Shirley, Jerry Wayne
Smith, Victor Hunt
Tambourin, Sauveur Dominique
Taylor, Franklin R.
Tugan, Gary E.
Wambach, Joseph Gabriel
Werr, Albert Joseph
Williams, Norman O.
Williams, Robert Harry
Wiltshire, Wallace Wayne, II
Winslow, David Allen

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ackerbauer, Blair
Allen, Charles Edward
Allen, Donald Curtis, Jr.
Allen, James Richard
Allshouse, Clare Ray
Anderson, William John, Jr.
Andvik, Brian Karl
Bacon, Thomas Alexander
Barrett, Gerard Jude
Beattie, Steven Richard
Bechard, Thomas Philip
Bell, Kenneth Hodges
Benroth, Barron Ray
Bovee, Stephen Paul
Brandenburg, Tim Robert
Britt, William Butch
Broaddus, James Anthony
Brubeck, Gregory William
Bruckner, William Lee, Jr.
Bukoski, Thomas John
Burns, Dennis Raymond James
Bussey, Dennis Raymond
Buttolph, Leslie Walter
Cahill, Patrick Joseph
Carl, James William
Carpenter, Ronald Gary
Cherry, John Marshal
Ching, Clayton Yuke Kee
Christensen, Thomas Holm
Clark, David James
Clements, Frederick Roger
Clough, Paul Leroy
Collins, John Patrick
Corbett, James Thomas
Cordes, Edward Jack, Jr.
Corsano, Arthur
Cosgrove, Donald Marschall
Craft, Gary Myers
Dean, Joseph Clay
Degon, Robert John
Delker, James Leo
Dempsey, John Garrett
Dempsey, Richard Michael
Dennis, David Reynolds
Devescovi, Daniel John
Dew, Fred Warren
Dierckman, Thomas Edward
Digeorge, Frank Peter, III
Dillon, Terry Michael
Duke, Jonathan Bruce
Ealy, James Edward
Elsbernd, Robert Lawrence
Erickson, Stephen Flanders
Faunce, John Roger
Fehlig, Charles Jerome
Fennema, Robert John
Foster, Michael Earl
Franklin, Jimmy Don
Galer, Kenneth Oriel
Gamble, Bobby Gene
Gebert, David Kirk
Gibb, Thomas Wilson, Jr.
Glynn, William Gardner
Guild, Christopher John
Gunn, Thomas Edward
Guthrie, Gene Scott, Jr.
Haas, Richard Fredrick, Jr.
Hadbavny, Michael Thomas
Hagge, Thomas Matthew
Hanes, Samuel Houston, Jr.
Haydon, Donald MacPherson, Jr.
Hein, Gary Wayne
Herning, Robert Eugene
Herriott, Thomas Ray
Hill, Jerry David
Hocker, Robert Gerad, Jr.
Holen, Douglas Johan
Holst, Ronald Paul
Horne, Dennis Eugene
Howell, Richard A.
Hudson, Ronald Richard
Huguelet, Thomas Lee
Johannesmeyer, Charles Alan
Johnson, James Kendall
Johnson, Michael Ray
Jones, John Eugene
Katz, Alan William
Kechter, Ronald Arnold

Keene, Ronald Earl
Keifer, John Michael
Keller, William Joseph, Jr.
Kiesling, Robert Franklin
King, Claude Vernon, III
Kleven, Courtney Craig
Knoll, Joseph Carl
Knowlton, Robert Dana
Koiro, Frank John, Jr.
Kotz, John Stanley
Kovalcik, James Patrick
Laboon, Thomas Alquin, Jr.
Lappano, Gilbert Christopher
Larson, Steven Carroll
Lewis, Howard Merrill
Lewis, Ronald Corey
MacNamara, Timothy Charles
Mann, Douglas Everett
Marshall, Peter Wayne
Martin, Norman Richard
Martz, Stephen Joseph
McKinney, Charles Gromici
McNeil Oscar Newby, Jr.
Messick Frederick S., Jr.
Miller, Paul J.
Molineaux, Ian Joseph
Morris, Donald Edward
Morris Donald Gene
Morrison, William James
Morrow, James Franklin, III
Murphy Bernard Francis, Jr.
Neibert, Jerry Steven
Newton, Willis Gerald
Niece, William Samuel
Norris, Lowell Robert III
Otcole, Thomas Richard
Palomaki, Donald William
Parisi, Anthony Michael
Parker, Robert Vernon
Parsons, Robert Charles
Penell, Joseph Charles
Perry, Michael J.
Pizzano, Robert Carl
Pollard Charles Hardin, Jr.
Pringle, Alec Todd
Puncke Frederick Dewey, Jr.
Pylant, Linward Ray
Pyles, Troy Kenton
Rabold Bernard Louis, Jr.
Rampe, Thomas Raymond
Rautenberg, Robert Carl
Rigby William Herman, Jr.
Rispoli, James Anthony
Roussos, George James
Rushing, Ernest Charles, Jr.
Sabbatini, Julian
Saltoun, Sammy
Scarborough, William Lang
Schneider, Charles Harry
Schottler, David Alan
Schramer, Mathias Charles
Scullion, Leonard Paul
Sebunia, Joseph Peter
Seltzer, George Harrison, III
Setzekorn, Robert Ray
Shapard, David Bruce
Shapard, Scott Holman
Sherbak, Patrick Michael
Shultz, Robert Larry
Sims, John Granville, III
Smith, Earl Lee, Jr.
Sniffin, Gary Norbert
Spencer, John Edward
Spore, James Sutherland, III
Stevens, David Lawrence
Stevenson, Herbert Scott
St. Peter, Harold Bruce
Sullivan, John James, Jr.
Szutenbach, Lawrence
Talmadge, Charles Eugene
Tanner, Thomas John
Terry, Ronald Elton
Thompson, Stephen Ray
Thomson, Francis Stoddard, Jr.
Tull, Terrence William
Turowski, Henry John, Jr.
Tyler, Raymond Stewart
Tzavaras, George Nicholas
Vanderels, David Michael
Venable, Joseph Brown
Vogel, Kenneth
Walker, William Francis
Walley, James Marvin, Jr.
Walsh, David Frank
Williams, James Randolph
Wong, Jack Jerry, Jr.
Wray, Terry Lynn
Wright, James Christopher
Zook, Michael Joseph

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Abbate, Guy Robert, Jr.
Babington, William Robert, Jr.
Baggett, Joseph Edward
Bagley, David Worth II
Baker, Stephen C.
Banks, Stephen Anthony
Barnett, Eric J.
Barrett, Danny Paul
Bartlett, James E. III
Beachy, Ronald James
Beall, Bradley Stuart
Becker, Fred Reinhardt, Jr.
Bell, Dale E.
Bennett, John C. W.
Bergstrom, Alan Lee
Boudewyns, Timothy M.
Bowman, Marion Eugene
Bozeman, William Steven
Buechler, Christopher L.
Carney, Patrick J.
Carroll, Steven John
Caruthers, William Philip
Champagne, Gerald Edward
Clark, Norman King
Clifford, William Joseph
Currivan, John Daniel
Dalesio, Daniel J., Jr.
Dawson, Mark Reed
Dirks, John A.
Dombroski, John Edward
Drukker, William R.
Duffy, Eugene O'Donnell
Eddy, Richard W. Jr.
Epstein, Howard Stephen
Fahrenbacher, Ronald Joseph
Finch, Milton D.
Froman, Floyd David
Gonzalez, Glenn Nelson
Gottry, Brian M.
Grant, William F., Jr.
Groat, John Sinclair, Jr.
Guter, Donald J.
Halvorson, James E.
Harrison, John Green, Jr.
Hewson, William Charles
Hill, Donal McIlvaine
Holz, George William
Horgan, Mark Michael
Hutson, John Dudley
Jeffries, Charles C., Jr.
Jones, Robin A.
Kelley, Patrick, W.
Kelly, David, Lee
Kelly, Michael, A.
Kirkpatrick, Gerald Joseph
Kusiak, Patrick John
Leachman, Timothy L.
Leclere, Dennis Edward
Ledvina, Thomas Neal
Mandsager, Dennis Lee
Martin, Thomas Latimer
Mattson, Michael V. H.
McCall, Thomas William L., Jr.
McClain, Tim Scott
McConnell, Daniel Dick
McCracken, Joseph Barry
McDonald, Alvin L.
McKenna, Lawrence Francis
McLaughlin, Peter John
McPartlin, Paul Edward
Meadows, Robert W.
Miller, William Alan
Mitchell, Thomas Wesley, Jr.
Monteith, Richard Alan
Montgomery, John Bernard
Morgan, John D.
Morrison, Thomas Allen
Muschamp, Werner L.
Osborne, Thomas William
Ottie, Frederick N.
Owens, Michael Russell
Parnell, Joe M.
Peace, David Leslie
Pinkelmann, Eugene Maurice, Jr.
Pointer, Homer Sterling, III
Prentace, Charles Stanley
Principi, Elizabeth A.
Prochazka, Frank J.
Radd, John David
Randall, Thomas Edward
Reeber, Christopher Joseph
Reeve, Thomas Burnell, Jr.
Reynolds, Albert Alle, Jr.
Robertson, Brian David
Rockwell, James D.
Rose, Stephen Anthony
Roti, Scott Lewis
Sabot, David A.
Scranton, Joseph Douglas
Seaman, Robert C.
Seiders, Marlin David, Jr.
Sheehan, Patrick J.
Smith, Harmon B.
Smith, Ronald Scott
Spence, Joseph Mervyn
Stewart, Richard Gant, Jr.
Stimson, Paul M.
Stonier, James J.
Strong, Franklin W., Jr.
Tapajcik, John Michael
Thompson, Paul B.
Turner, Thomas Gordon
Villemez, Clyde Joseph, Jr.
Walsh, Richard Francis
Welch, Donald P.
Westholm, Larry Richard
White, Richard A.
Williams, Jeffry Alan
Wright, Steven Earl
Wurzel, David Lawrence
Yuhas, Christine Maria
Zoellner, David Howard

DENTAL CORPS

Aker, Frank, III
Albright, Robert Louis
Antioquia, Benjamin Salvador
Baker, Darrel A.
Barco, Clark T.
Basehoar, Douglas A.
Biedermann, Kurt George
Bohl, Jay L.
Boyd, William J., Jr.
Brinkley, Eugene D., Jr.
Brown, Gordon M., Jr.
Caruso, John Anthony
Cathers, Samuel J.
Christian, Leslie Allen
Creal, Albert Franklin, Jr.
Cuprak, Elizabeth E.
Degroote, Douglas F., Jr.
Devin, Robert Fraser
Dodd, Robin B.
Dollard, Wayne J.
Elvers, Ronald D.
Elzie, Theodis
Engler, Robert A.
Fox, Wendell Joseph
Froistad, Larry A.
Galich, John William, Jr.
Haglund, Michael P.
Harrison, Glenn A.
Hartsook, Timothy Merwyn
Hickson, Harry T.
Hoffman, Barry B.
Huebner, Dennis R.
Hutter, Jeffrey W.
Jaworski, Charles P.
Johnson, Jimmy Ray
Keeney, Bradford L.
Klein, Kenneth M.
Koffler, David Gary

Krochmal, James E.
Landry, Kenneth Edward
Latham, Peter M.
Little, Michael E.
Loar, Robertson D.
Lutcavage, Gregory Joseph
Marsaw, Frederick A., Jr.
Maynard, Robert D.
McAmis, Ronald Wayne
McDonald, William H.
Mehlenbeck, Clarence W., III
Meyer, Daniel M.
Milnichuk, Walter M.
Motley, Hudson G.
Prendergast, Richard O.
Reavis, Ralph M.
Rech, John R.
Remington, David Newell
Rivera, Napoleon Dimayuga
Roahen, James O.
Rocklin, Michael F.
Sandifer, Johnny B.
Schmid, Paul Edward
Schroeder, Dawn C.
Sergent, Robert S.
Simecek, John W.
Smith, Raymond G.
Starck, Thomas F.
St. Germain, Henry A., Jr.
Tercha, David Peter
Topcik, Philip L.
Turner, Carol Irene Baker
Turner, Harry Guthrie
Twohey, Sheila McCabe
Walker, Cleodius
Weisner, John Turner
Wetzel, Jeffrey Peter
Wilcox, Dale E.
Wilkinson, Richard J.
Wolff, Arthur

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Robert Wallace
Agent, Selwyn Keith
Ambler, Fredrick Alan
Anderson, Richard Leland
Arnold, Anthony Ray
Auld, John Nelson
Avriett, Lucinda Louise
Baker, Charles Warren
Baker, Gerald Clayton
Baltimore, Daniel Lewis
Baltrukonis, Joselph Vincent
Banellis, Georgiana Marie
Barber, Norman James
Barina, Fred George, Jr.
Barnett, Phillip Jay
Bason, Robert
Bawden, Monte Paul
Beasley, William Joe
Beatty, Earl, III
Bennett, James Douglas
Benson, Milton Junior
Betts, Lawrence Stilwell
Blanks, James Alvin
Blome, Michael Albert
Bohnet, Herbert F.
Bolduc, Paul R.
Bolshazy, Robert Stephen
Bolton, Herbert Thomas
Bowman, Jeffry Stephen
Boyce, Richard
Boyles, Robert Warren
Bransford, Charles Duane
Breton, Robert William
Broadhurst, Ronald Wayne
Brown, George Russell
Brunza, John Jay
Bryan, Clark Lee
Buffington, John Robert
Butler, David Eugene
Campos, Theodore Ramiro
Carroll, Norman Eugene
Carroll, Robert Maxwell
Casper, Arthur W., Jr.
Chalstrom, William John
Chapman, Raymond Nicholas, Jr.
Christiansen, Richard Allen
Christopher, John Peter
Clarkson, Wallace Martin
Conroe, Frank Gus
Contreras, Thomas Jose, Jr.
Converse, James Donald
Cooper, James Melvin
Cosenza, Joseph Monte
Cozart, William David III
Crabbe, Joel Reed
Crafton, Lonnie Dale
Crane, James Arthur
Crigler, Patricia Woodall
Criscitiello, Joseph John
Crittenden, George Howard
Cronin, Patrick Dwight
Daddario, Anthony P.
Davis, Gary Thayne
Dean, Larry Marcellis
Debell, Robert Michael
Decicco, Joseph Enrico
Decker, David Leroy
Defibaugh, Thomas Richard
Delong, Douglas Stanley
Delviks, Uldis Albert
Densley, Merlynn Duane
Depolo, Dominick, Jr.
Dial, William Stephen
Dittman, David
Dumais, Gary Wayne
Dunkleman, Dennis Clair
Eberle, James Edward
Eckstein, Michael David
Edman, David C.
Ehrhardt, Dougals Alan
Elkins, Bryan Richard
Elster, Robert Eric
Escamilla, Joel
Ewing, Ronald Clarence
Faherty, Stephen Allen
Farnham, John Brett
Felton, Robert Eugene
Ferda, Robert
Finke, Ronnie Lee
Flor, William John
Fogelsonger, Jack Leonard
Ford, James David
Foro, Bradley Roger
Foster, Jerry Allen
Fraser, Llewellyn Michael
Frey, Mary Lucille
Fristad, Arvid Christian
Ganz, Neal Robert
Gentry Murray, Jr.
Gerhard, John Charles, III
Gerlach, Herman
Gibson, Kenneth Dwight
Glogower, Frederick D.
Glover, Wayne Paul
Gordon, Charles Vance, Jr.
Gray, Brian Harold
Greedan, Andre Michael
Greenan, John Everett, III
Greenfield, Donald Eugene
Grimes, Thomas Abner
Grissom, Michael Phillip
Grout, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Hand, Brian Chandler
Hanrahan, James Edward
Hargraves, David Thomas
Harrington, Gary Robert
Harris, William Baxter
Harrison, Robert Burnham, Jr.
Helm, Wade Raymond
Henderson, Charles, III
Henrich, William Roger
Hermann, Dean Alfred
Hess, Stuart Allan
Hickey, Rodney Dale
Hickey, Thomas Michael
Hicks, William Marlin
Higgins, Janet Lorelei
Hilderbrand, Richard Lance
Hisoire, Dennis Philip
Holman, Larry Dean
Homayssi, Ruby Lee
Hosszu, Joseph Lewis
Hughes, Francis Joseph
Hughes, Roger Dale
Huju, John Iivo
Hummel, James Robert
Humphrey, Charles Robert
Irgens, Terry Richard
Irving, John
Jackson, Thomas Carter
Jamison, Hubert Milton
Jemionek, John Felix
Jillson, Susan Gerhard
Johnson, John Lawrence, Jr.
Jones, Buddy Lowell
Joseph, William Arthur
Kayler, Robert Samuel
Kelley, David Bruce
Kelly, Stephen John
Knee, Dale Otis
Knight, Paul Leroy
Kochis, James Balazs
Kretchmer, Robert Stanford
Kubal, John Lawrence
Kunkel, Clyde Ellsworth
Kurtich, Richard Bruce
Lamar, Steven Richard
Lambert, William James, Jr.
Land, Clarence Edward
Lane, Coy B.
Lane, John Charles
Larocco, James Michael
Lawrence, Jonathan Dale
Lemmerman, Donald John
Lewis, James Stanford
Lewis, Marion Stewart
Lewis, Morris Newman
Lindsay, Richard John
Lissner, Christopher Roland
Lobaugh, Larry Gene
Love, Douglas, Jr.
Macys, David Allen
Mahin, Patrick Lee
Makris, Kenneth Anthony
Malinky, Robert Lee
Malinoski, James Walter
Malone, John Joseph
Marolf, Walter Keithley
Martin, Donna Ray
Martin, Early Michael
Maskulak, Michael Joseph
Masterson, Francis W., Jr.
McBride, Joseph Edward
McCaig, Joe Mickey
McKee, Roland Edmond
McKenzie, Darrel Dean
Meegan, James Michael
Mendenhall, Karl George
Miller, David Albert
Mitchell, Michael Lenard
Mitchell, Troy Gene
Mize, Lewis William
Monaghan, William Patrick
Montgomery, John Edward
Morrison, Kathleen Dougherty
Morrison, Tommy Ross
Morton, David Earl
Moses, William Robert
Mueller, Eric John, II
Muklevicz, Robert Edward
Mullin, Jack Aldin
Mullin, Jimmie John
Nelson, Dennis Pershing
Nelson, Ronald Carl
Oals, Wendell Marion, Jr.
Oldham, Richard Thomas
Ollenburg, Walter Albert
Otterman, Glenn Ewing, Jr.
Owens, Jerry Mack
Palmer, James Felix
Parkansky, Ralph Elmer
Parks, Jackie Howard
Parr, Laurence Fredrick
Patee, Jerry Curtis
Pavlik, Robert Emil
Penkunas, John Joseph
Perkins, Nancy Schmitz
Petersen, Henrik Vang
Peterson, Franz Richard
Peterson, Jack Leroy
Petroski, Joseph William

Phillips, Harold Edward
Pinkerton, Randy Howard
Pointer, Charles Hannon, IV
Power, Danny Edwin
Prodanovich, Milo J.
Rand, Bruce Paul
Rathjen, Roger Lee
Raymond, James Lyman
Reading, Thomas Edward
Reichman, David Alan
Reinhart, David Francis
Renfro, Mary Ann
Renner, Vernon Manderfeld
Richardson, Ronald W.
Ridgeway, Robert Kirk
Rinard, Lanny Arnold
Rittmeyer, Terry Lee
Roach, William Lawrence, Jr.
Rockhill, Robert Clayton
Roman, Michael John
Rooney, John Anthony
Rosen, Howard Stephen
Ruffin, Tommy Lee
Rush, Elvin Dale
Rutherford, Bruce Douglas
Ryan, Alan Burns
Saleker, Albert Dale
Sandall, Vernon Pat
Santore, Orlando James, Jr.
Scaramozzino, James Anthony
Schick, Gary Edward
Schlagel, Charles John
Schoeneck, Harry Joseph, Jr.
Schweinfurth, Karl Edwin
Sciarrini, Dominic Eugene
Seales, David Martin
Sefranek, George Andrew
Seible, Lawrence George
Sengbusch, Craic Howard
Sessions, Nathan Mansfield
Sheeran, Robert B.
Shepherd, James Edison
Sheridan, Peter Francis
Sherman, Forrest Allen
Shockley, Richard Stanley
Silvas, Jose Moises
Simmons, Larry Oliver
Skog, Roy Reynold, Jr.
Skurja, Michael, Jr.
Sloan, Robert William
Smith, Donald Anthony
Smith, Richard Lee
Smith, Steven Linck
Snook, Darrell Fred
Snyder, Stephen Laurie
Sparks, Buddy Tom
Speece, Elizabeth Sophia G.
Speir, Herbert Allison, III
Spillane, Dennis
Stine, John Wesley
Stovall, Gary Hudson
Straughn, William R.
Strnad, William Raymond
Struempler, Richard Earl
Terry, Lynn Marion
Thomas, Dennis Merrill
Thomas, Jerry Alan
Thompson, J. Ronald
Thompson, Robert Stanley
Tingley, Terry Jay
Todd, David James
Todd, Michael Louis
Trocha, Paul John
Trosper, James Hamilton
Turocy, Regis Harry
Upton, Billy Gene
Vonminden, David L.
Vonstuck, Murlowe Leon
Waddington, Gregory
Walker, James Raborn
Wallace, William Emory
Watts, Len Stanley
Weappa, Larry Ralph
Weathersby, Paul Kirby
Welch, Richard Roy
West, Joseph John
White, Daniel Ellsworth
Whiten, Ronnie Edward
Wiggins, Michael Cornell
Wilson, Don Dewayne
Wolf, Richard
Wood, Arthur Bob
Woods, Walden Ray
Wright, Albert Lon
Yacovissi, Robert
Yost, Harry Eino
Zeman, Gary H.
Zimmerman, Craig Alan

NURSE CORPS

Ahrens, William David
Allison, Rachel V.
Ames, Ervin Lyle
Applegate, Joanne Wilson
Arthur, Beverly Kathryn
Atkinson, Nancy June
Ault, Sally Barras
Bailey, Donna Lancaster
Bardwell, Robert Jean
Barlow, Judy Lynn
Bates, Richard A.
Baumann, Mary Ann Ervin
Beaton, Meredith Lee
Bechtel, Robert Hershey, Jr.
Beeby, Barbara Jean
Benway, Michael William
Bessent, William Moses
Bickford, Carol Jean
Biffar, Irene Marie
Bingham, Marilyn Kay
Bloodworth, Maritha Ophelia
Bogart, Deanna Rae
Bohn, James David
Bold, Joan Ann
Bolden, Cheryl Vreeland
Bonnet, Langston Kathleen Marie
Bonta, Catharine Mary
Born, Karen Rae
Bowden, Mary Alice
Boyer, John Frederick
Boyle, Mary Elizabeth
Brake, Barbara Deck
Breeding, Patricia Ann
Bridges, Uriah
Brinckerhoff, Judith Costello
Broad, John Robert
Brown, David Allen
Brown, Paul Peyton
Brown, Terry Lou
Burns, Jesse Paul, Jr.
Burns, Kathryn Patri[illegible]
Cabral, Richard Emile
Caffrey, Gloria Jean
Caffrey, John Francis
Campbell, David Allen
Campbell, Mari Elizabeth T.
Capps, Karen Newhouse
Carlton, Carolyn Zak
Carney, Carol Anne
Carroll, Sue Miller
Carter, Eileen
Casa, Peggy Baker
Cherrington, Dolores Ann
Chick, Carole Louise
Christensen, Clark Kay
Christian, Catherine Scollins
Christman, Patricia Kate
Cisneros, Thomasa Lena
Coffman, Peggy Sue
Cole, Stephanie Ann
Cornish, David Luther
Correnti, Patrick Sullivan
Cothern, Jimmie Glenn
Cox, Robert LeRoy, Jr.
Craft, Donna Leigh
Cranston, Christine Sullivan
Cronin, Dorothy Ryder
Cronin, Mary Ann
Curlee, Candace
Cusimano, Carol Marie
Daniels, Luther Orin
David, Lucy Mendoza
Davidson, William Murray, IV
Dawe, Cecelia Margaret
Deliberto, Vincent Loretto
Depoix, Suzanne Gabrielle
Deprima, Alicia G.
Desavorgnani, Adriane Aldric
Devney, Anne Marie
Dibiase, Renee R.
Doyle, Marica Smith
Doyle, Wanda
Dunn, Richard Allen
Eckstein, Barbara Jeanne B.
Edgar, Marilyn Anne
Elliott, Iris Ann
Ellis, Susan Lynn F.
Emanuel, Anne Marie
Eversole, Donna Rae
Fay, Doris Annie
Ferguson, Raymond Austin
Feris, Michael Leeroy
Field, Marion Griffith, Jr.
Figgins, David Earl
Fijak, Susan Ann
Finn, Thomas J.
Flynn, Mary Taylor
Foley, Barbara Ann
Foore, Karen Irene
Fosson, Donald Eugene
Foster, Barbara Jean
Frazee, Daniel Clark
Fry, June Grace
Fuller, Gae Marie
Gantz, Gary Stephen
Gardner, Mary Anne
Garrison, Richard Allen
Goetz, Mary Elizabeth
Gotch, Sandra Anne
Graham, Alred Ernest, Jr.
Grant, Kristina Meservey
Gray, Pamela
Greene, Doris Mary
Griffiths, Loretta Ann
Gump, Margaret Lungren
Gutierrez, Gail Ann
Guy, Bruce David
Haley Kathleen Ann
Hall, Mary Katherine
Hambidge, Ann Ashley
Hancock, Susan Henry
Hargrave, Michael Rex
Harmeyer, Gary R.
Hart, Elizabeth Kunc
Hartman, Toby Slep
Hash, Connie Rae
Haskins, Carol Callan
Hayes, Linda Ann
Haynes, Janice Klaiber
Head, Walter Weller, Jr.
Hemmelgarn, Nina Terese
Henbest, David
Hess, Catherine Pauline
Heydon, Mary Margaret
Hobbs, Linda High
Hodges, Gail Lynn
Holmes, Lawrence Charles
Honeywell, Joseph Leroy
Hoover, Margaret Leona
Houser, Mary Louise
Hughesrease, Marsha Lynette
Hultsch, Maureen Cecilia
Hyams, Orval Wayne
Hyatt, Carol Susan
Jackson, Donna Jeane
James, Eva Nell
Johnson, Charlene Elizabeth
Johnson, Donna Lerch
Johnson, Joe Hormon
Johnson, Laurie Lynn
Jones, Donald Gerard
Jones, Donna Marie
Jones, James Edward
Jung, James Wyland
Karrat, Victoria Jean
Kelly, Harriet Perry
Kjenstad, James Eugene
Kopanski, Ruth Grimes
Korns, Barbera Jean
Kout, Kathryn Kelly
Kozlowski, Janet Gorczyca
Krahenbuhl, Allie Fair
Kunkel, Ann Marie

Labelle, Carson Verne
Laberis, Arthur Henry
Lahren, Kathy Sue
Lanterman, Gail Ann
Lapiant, Michele Ann
Laursen, Lawrence Edwin
Law, Easty Ann
Lefort, David Michael
Leppanen, Margaret
Lewis, Rosalie Day
Lewisbrown, Shirley Dean
Loftus, Margaret Mary
Lombardi, Judith Ellen
Loose, David Stewart
Loveridge, Lois Elaine
Lovett, John Reuben
[illegible], Eugenio Alfonso
[illegible], Frankie
Mahaffey, Betty Jeanne
[illegible], Patricia Mary
[illegible], Bernadette
Malone, Diane
Mapes, Sigrun Marianne
Marine, Peggy Diane
Marquart, Alison Lee
Marsh, George Lawrence
Marsh, Sharon Jane
Matula, David Louis
May, Rita Viola
McBurney, Richard Ellwood
McClain, Terry Worth
McLaurin, Elizabeth Annette
McMillin, John Marshall
McPherson, Robert Carter
Michael, Dorothy Ann
Miller, Barbara Orange
Mills, Stephani Gail
Minnick, Kristine Ellen
Minzes, David Herman
Mitchell, Henry, Jr.
Monahan, Michael Edward
Monroe, Victoria Mae
Moore, Louise Fontaine
Morris, Louise Margaret
Moses, Melanie Lorena
Mullinix, Margaret Berg
Neirynck, William Edward
Nelson, Roberta Dawn
Nickerson, Carolyn Janice
Niess, Cynthia Deanna
Nierman, Jane E.
Norrick, Albert Joseph
Norris, Linwood Wayne
Norton, Suzanne Marie
O'Halloran, Jeannine Lynn
O'Hare, Patricia Jeanne
Ohlman, Donna Jean Van Buren
Osborn, David Lane
Parrotte, David Frank
Pattinson, Judith Ann
Perry, Cynthia E.
Perry, Eleanor Elsie
Peake, Lorelei Sue
Petersen, Patricia Lynn
Peterson, Carol Ann
Peterson, Janet Lou
Peterson, Peggy Jo
Phillips, Donald W., Jr.
Phillips, Jean Marie
[illegible], Christine Anne
Poland, Edith Aletta
Powers, John Charles, II
Prather, Caren Joell
Probst, Louise Gale Ahroon
Protsman, Nancy Lee
Pruitt, Nancy Strohschein
Ramsey, Barbara Lynn
Reiter, Larry Leon
Reitz, Anne Elizabeth
Rice, Edward Vincent
Richardson, James Leroy
Riess, Marymartha
Riordan, Patricia Trump
Roberts, James Wylie
Robinson, Leslie Elizabeth
Robson, John Edward
Rollenhagen, Judith Murray
Rollison, Lee Kathleen
Rossi, Maria Victoria
Rowell, Margaret Elinor
Roy, Terry Dale
Rucker, Meriel Traylor
Ruschmeier, Elizabeth Muller
Sample, Priscilla
Samson, Mary Wells
Sant, Jeanne Paulette
Savige, Elaine Charlotte
Scarborough, Claudette
Schafer, Dwight D.
Schemmer, Carol Lucy
Scheve, Lawrence Gale
Schneider, Donald Philip
Schnoor, Elaine Helen
Schwartz, Linda Lee
Sciuto, Renata Magdalynne
Shaia, Evelyn Ruth
Sharpe, Jacqueline Elaine
Shaw, Irene Antoinette
Sheffer, Jeanette Ann
Shelton, Mary Cornelius
Sheridan, Gary Clinton
Sitton, Loretto Anne
Smith, Julianne K.
Smith, Kate Irene
Smith, Kathleen Ann
Smola, Theresa Noreen
Snyder, Barbara Jean
Snyder, Gilbert Charles
Soileau, Joseph Corley
Soppe, Wilfred Edward, Jr.
Spangler, Catherine Elaine
Speirs, Carol Lucille
Spillane, Susan Jane
Spraggins, Gerald Gene
Standen, Julianne
Sturrock, John Richard
Sullivan, Dennis James
Swan, Catherine Ann
Swanson, Jane Westmoreland
Taggart, Jack Reed
Taschner, Ardis L.
Taylor, Ruth Ann
Templeton, Alma Nancy
Thomas, Barbara Jane
Thorr, Faye Ann
Timmcke, Teresa Ann
Tomsky, Carol Nanette
Trent, James Edward
Truhe, Jean Anne
Tynan, James Francis, Jr.
Underwood, Earma Jean
Vickers, Joyce Marilyn
Vonrump, David Chester
Walgren, Kenneth Dale
Wallace, Blair Harrison
Ward, Deborah Ann
Ward, Elizabeth Ann
Warren, Carolyn Sue
White, Grace Milesko
Whitney, Wendy Wilson
Williams, Mary Deborah
Wooldridge, Robert Thomas
Wright, Mitchell Paul
Young, Robert Raymond
Zabel, Nancy Diane
Zettler, Marcella Rose

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and various staff corps, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adamson, James Aubrey
Ahern, Richard Matthew
Anderson, Jack Edward
Avery, Michael L.
Bach, Ronald Clayton
Bailey, Richard Alan
Baker, Gary Stewart
Baker, William Edward Jr.
Barrett, Gary Allen
Barrett, Stephen Darryl
Bartol, Robert Michael
Barton, Edward Brent
Bashista, David D.
Batson, Charles D.
Bauer, Larry Anthony
Baxter, Harry Toppin
Bayman, Jay W.
Beckham, Gregory Thomas
Beckman, Matthew Phillip
Beemer, John Robert
Bell, Joseph Leonidas
Belotti, Joseph Peter Jr.
Benn, Charles Michael
Benner, Stuart Charles
Bennett, Charles Everett
Bertoglio, James Alan
Birr, Douglas Raymond
Bizic, Larry Stephen
Blake, Clifford Dale
Blanton, Lindsay Chambers, Jr.
Blatt, Norman William
Blevins, Dallas, Jr.
Bohman, Richard Bursey
Boniface, John Morrill
Boraten, Ronald Paul
Bower, Bruce Alan
Boyles, Glenn R.
Bradshaw, David Bruce
Brady, Patrick Donald
Brainerd, Stephen Scott
Brandt, Rudolph C.
Braselman, Herbert P.
Brazell, Mark Thomas
Bricker, John Larry
Britts, James Ellsworth
Brown, Boyd Michael
Broyles, Ned Anthony
Burns, Brian H.
Burrill, David Reid
Burton, Malcolm Charles
Bush, Thomas Lee
Buske, Steven Paul
Butler, Dwight Allen
Butler, Sean William
Byrnes, Thomas G., III
Caldwell, Kenneth Wright
Cameron, Thomas W.,
Cann, John D.
Cannon, James Dennis
Canzonieri, Ronald John
Cassady, Gregory Allan
Caya, Peter M.
Chirone, Robert Laurence
Claire, Richard Duane
Cole, Ellerbe Powe
Coll, Rafael
Conatser, Charlie Cameron
Conley, William E.
Conner, George Wayne
Conway, Michael R.
Cooper, Arthur Thomas
Copus, William Everett
Costi, Ronald J.
Cowart, David C.
Cranney, Steven Joseph
Crawford, John Glover, Jr.
Crumbaugh, Richard Daniel
Cummins, Ronald H.
Curry, Michael John
Daume, James Walter
Davis, Richard Rice
Dean, Billy Joe
Dean, William Edwin
Deantonio, Robert F.
Dent, Larry William
Denton, Larry M.
Dethmann, Wernes William
Devault, Richard H.
Dieckman, Byron L.
Divine, Robert Blaine
Dobrovolny, Timothy
Donahoe, Raymond Wayne
Donnalley, Kenneth Girard
Donnelly, William Joseph
Doss, David Leon

Doub, Mark Eugene, Jr.
Dowie, Jon W.
Downs, James Lee
Drees, Martin A.
Duchock, Peter Stephen
Duetsch, Robert Alfred
Dull, David A.
Dunn, Alan Bruce
Dunphey, Floyd Patrick
Dutra, Edward P., Jr.
Dyer, Michael O.
Erwin, Richard A.
Ewans, George William
Faino, Rod
Falt, Keith E.
Farver, Rick Clark
Fiddler, Chris J.
Fillmon, Louis J.
Fisher, William Harold
Fitzgibbons, Paul E.
Flaherty, James, Jr.
Flanagan, John Joseph, III
Flannery, Peter Andrew
Forte, Bruce Frederick
Foster, Dave E.
Frank, Joel Stephen
Franks, Robert James
Frantz, Joseph Claude
Frazier, Early H., Jr.
Garcia, David Bruce
Gardiner, George Wiltshire
Gaussiran, Charles Douglas
Gibson, Steven Edward
Goldsmith, James Edward, Jr.
Graham, David Joseph
Graham, David Lee
Graham, Roy Edward, Jr.
Grant, Roy Edward
Gray, James Myron
Green, Thomas James, Jr.
Gregory, Thomas Wilbur
Griffin, Lee Bradford
Groenert, Edward Thomas, Jr.
Grupe, David Arthur
Gryde, Stanley
Guarneri, James M.
Guetter, Paul Michael, Jr.
Hadden, Carlyle Frederick
Hall, Edward Cabot
Harbison, Donald Stewart, Jr.
Harrer, Max Warren
Harrilchak, Robert
Harris, Norman Louis, Jr.
Hartsough, David L.
Hartwell, Jerold Keith
Harty, John, III
Hastings, John Thomas
Hathaway, Robert Richard
Haynes, Frederick Melvin
Hazelrig, John P.
Hendrix, Richard M.
Hershberger, Van Louis
Heuring, Joel Norman
Hey, Roy E.
Hill, Ronald Steven
Hines, Jerome H.
Hogan, Steven Joseph
Hoke, Robert E.
Hollar, Bernhard Klaus
Holmes, Merrill Dennis, Jr.
Holmes, Richard Nelson
Hookanson, James Frederick
Hooker, Gilbert Norman
Horan, John M.
Howell, Roger Eckert, Jr.
Howerter, Craig Eddie
Hubbard, Dale R.
Huestis, Walter Wess
Hyland, Joel Thomas
Hynes, Michael W.
Ingalls, Robert D., III
Inverso, Francis Carlo
Jackson, Joseph Ingrahm, Jr.
Janecek, Craig Michael
Janka, Dennis W.
Johnston, John Wesley
Jones, Jerry Dean
Jones, Richard Douglas
Kane, Thomas J.
Kearney, James Philip
Kellard, Michael George
Keresey, James Kirkwood
King, Edward Gaines
King, John Michael
King, Michael Reedy
Kinneberg, Paul W.
Kinney, Kenneth Byron
Kisinger, Thomas J.
Kistler, John S.
Kitch, Max Edward
Koehler, David Arthur
Kolle, George, N., Jr.
Kumpan, Gregory Louis
Kurth, Ronald Brent
Laflair, Keith R.
Lamar, Robert V.
Lane, Michael John
Largent, William Dayton
Larsen, Samuel Harry
Larson, Robert J.
Law, Earl Wesley
Lawlor, John Conrad, Jr.
Lebourgeois, Earl Joseph, Jr.
Lekberg, Eric Leonard
Liebschner, Douglas Vincent
Lien, John E.
Liptak, William Steven, Jr.
Loeslein, George Frederic, Jr.
Long, Kirk Alan
Long, William Alton, Jr.
Luck, Eugene Wilson
Lyman, Richard Lawrence
MacDonell, Rory A.
Madfes, David Bruce
Maifert, Steven C.
Manning, Ernest Devon, III
Martin, Edward Albert
Massey, Walter B.
Masslofsky, Anthony Paul
Matt, Michael Robert
Matthew, Henry F.
Mattson, Royce Runar
May, Clark Darwin, Jr.
May, John Donald
Maynard, Hamilton Keith
McCabe, Robert J.
McClanahan, Joseph Edward
McGonigle, Paul Wood
McLemore, Robert Seay
McLeod, Roderick Donald
McMacken, Patrick Bilby
McMullin, Greffrey L.
McPherson, Donald Ray
Meis, Ronald J.
Metz, Roger C., Jr.
Michalski, Conrad Michael
Micken, Robert W.
Miles, Wilson Ashley
Miller, Dana Fontaine
Miller, Karl W.
Miller, Lanny Kay
Mills, Dennis Reginald
Mitcham, Mark Timothy
Mitnik, John
Morris, Larry Lemoyne
Morrissey, Michael Joseph
Morrow, Roy Edward
Moss, Duval Fletcher, III
Moulton, David Wales
Murphy, William
Murrell, Gene David
Naphas, James Harry
Neil, Robert Dale
Newman, Don R.
Norris, Phillip Kay
Nyland, Henry Joseph, III
Olmstead, David E.
Parkin, Ernest Allen
Paternoster, Joseph Carl
Patterson, Daniel J.
Payne, Terry Daniel
Peck, John Phillip
Pelstring, Stephen
Perkins, Thomas Arcade, III
Peterson, Patrick Brian
Pettit, John Mullin
Petykowski, Jerome Leonard
Pilgrim, Carlo M.
Pittman, Alan Ralph
Plichta, Thomas E.
Porterfield, Craig
Power, John Francis
Quinn, James Joseph
Raster, Stephen Edward
Rautenberg, Ronald Ernest
Recordon, Richard Louis
Refo, Ian Blair
Reisig, Rowland Dean
Rew, Robert Esson, III
Reynolds, Curtis Ray
Rice, William Thomas
Riggs, Brian Fred
Rishel, Michael Paul
Roach, Dennis Kaye
Roberts, John David, Jr.
Robinett, Earl Fountain, Jr.
Rodriquez, John Bartholomew
Rosenberger, Dale Kent
Roy, Thomas H.
Royal, Thomas Arthur
Rudolph, Sheridan Francis
Russell, Thomas Howard
Rylant, Arboth Andrew
Sameit, Douglas E.
Sandberg, Robert Duane
Sanderson, Gilles Charles
Santoro, Alfred Paul
Schalk, John Edward
Schape, James Warburton
Schechinger, Terry Dean
Schiano, Richard James
Scholefield, Ronald J.
Schultz, James Calvin
Schulz, Carl Joseph
Schum, Michael Edward
Scribner, David A.
Searcy, William Ray
Sein, Lorenzo
Sellers, David Noel
Seymour, James Warren
Shilling, Samuel George
Shower, William Arn
Slattery, Timothy Patrick
Slider, Victor Lee
Smalley, Lewis Hathorn, Jr.
Smart, James Dennis
Smedberg, James Eric
Smith, Gregory Clare
Sontag, William C.
Spottswood, Stephen A.
Staten, Calvin Claude
Stevenson, Alan Martin
Strzemienski, Stephan Joseph
Sullivan, Frederic Glenn
Svanson, Gust G.
Swanberg, Geoffrey Merritt
Talunas, Walter Thomas
Tank, Arthur Newton
Tanner, Eric V.
Tate, Arthur Robert
Taylor, Terry Lee
Taylor, William Ferguson
Tener, Richard D.
Thomas, Shirley J.
Thompson, Larry Francis
Thompson, Maury Weldon, Jr.
Thompson, Merle Neeley, Jr.
Thrasher, Kenneth Charles
Threlkel, Daniel M.
Tinker, Clifford Jay
Townsend, Hugh Entricken
Turner, Dennis Jerome
Turner, Galen E., Jr.
Turner, James Edward, Jr.
Vaughters, Jon Craig
Veal, Donald R.
Verhalen, John Philip, Jr.
Voniak, Ronald Philip
Voss, Joseph Gilbert
Wagner, Charles William
Wall, Thomas Arthur
Wallace, William Carl
Warner, Richard Beaty

Washburn, Ronald W.
Watts, Bruce Alan
Webster, Donald Richard
Weed, Peter W.
Weesner, Wesley Craig
Wertenberger, Thomas Robins
Wilkinson, Morris Albert
Williams, John Earl
Wilson, James Terry
Windsor, William Douglas
Wirick, Dennis W.
Witthar, James Henry
Wnuk, Henry John
Wootton, Ronald Elwyn
Wright, Edward Joe
Wright, Timothy A.
Wylie, Pete
Younce, Jonathan Peter
Young, James Stephen
Young, John Wesley, Jr.
Ziemer, Paul Lawson, Jr.
Zimmer, Larry W.
Zimmerman, Stephen Arthur
Ziska, Frederick

MEDICAL CORPS

Abbott, David John
Aleta, Elenita Farro
Allison, Jack Randolph
Almeida, John L., Jr.
Alona, Bienvenido Raz, Jr.
Altaffer, Lawrence F., III
Anthony, Marion D.
Avalos, Jack Candido
Ayers, Warren V.
Aznar, Sonia Ferry
Azucena, Laurel C.
Bailey, Philip James
Barnes, Roger A.
Bean, Terrell W.
Bell, Jeffrey G.
Bell, Mark Gerald
Bharadwaja, Krishan
Bibro, Mary Catherine
Bohman, Harold R.
Borah, Bishnu Charan
Borst, George C., III
Bosley, Carl E.
Bott, Jay Cordell
Brawley, Robert L.
Bray, Patrick G.
Brillhart, Thompson, III
Brooks, Daniel A.
Brown, Dennis F.
Buck, Janet Harriet
Bulosan, Emedio B.
Burdick, Richard Lawrence
Burgess, Richard C.
Burkey, Thomas Michael
Burnett, Robert J.
Burnette, Douglas George, Jr.
Bush, Richard G.
Calderon, Jose Francisco
Carambas, Clarita Rubic
Carter, James F.
Carter, William Thomas, Jr.
Castleberry, Gordon M.
Cehan, Eugene Gregory
Chernow, Bart
Cho, Michael Min Woo
Clayton, Malcolm D., III
Colby, Steven David
Cole, Richard L.
Coleman, Stuart Hunt
Collietti, Patrick Joseph
Colvin, Donald B.
Cook, Stephen Standish
Cowan, Bryan D.
Creutz, Robert E.
Crittenden, Jacob Keith, III
Crowder, William E., Jr.
Crowley, Michael L.
Cunnion, Stephen Owen
Curran, James Joseph
Cushman, Austin R.
Dabbs, William Alexander, Jr.
Daniell, Fredric Dickey, Jr.
Davis, Glenn M.
Delamorena, Alfonso
Dembert, Mark L.
Desrosiers, Paul Michael
Diaz, Carlos Ricardo
Dohrmann, Mary Lea
Doyle, Edward Jerome, Jr.
Dubbs, William Franklyn
Dulay, Rolando Padua
Duvalarnould, Bertrand J. M.
Ebert, Edward L.
Eisold, John F.
Elkins, Thomas E.
Elleson, Dale A.
Elsonbaty, Atef Girgis
Enghardt, Michael H.
Engler, Renata J.
Evans, Robert M.
Ewing, Willie B.
Fichera, Anthony Peter
Fink, Mitchell Phillip
Flandry, Robert Jr.
Fraker, Robert T.
Franceschi, Zambrana Jorge
Francisco, Reynaldo Molina
Freeman, Louie Donell
Gibson, Donald Lee
Glover, Matthew U.
Gnadt, Gregory James
Goodin, Thomas Elliott, III
Governski, David Anthony
Graney, William Francis
Greenway, Hubert T., Jr.
Grimsley, William Archie, Jr.
Haley, Roger J.
Hall, Lee Davis
Hall, R. B., II
Hamlett, Frank
Handler, Jeffrey B.
Hartwig, Bruce A.
Harvey, Kevin Gregory
Hastedt, Randall C.
Hein, Douglas P.
Henderson, Harry M., III
Henken, Dale Preston
Heroman, William M.
Herr, Harlan G.
Herzog, Thomas Harry
Hewanlowe, Karlene Opal
Hicks, James M.
Hill, Robert Bruce
Hiregoudar, Mohan L.
Hoffman, Janaleigh
Holden, Randall William
Howell, Irvin Wendell, Jr.
Jacobson, Paul Kenneth
Jaituni, Sudhir A.
Johnson, Richard B.
Joiner, Charles R.
Jones, Martin W.
Katona, Ildy Margaret
Kaufman, Albert E.
Kent, Peter D.
Kerrigan, Kevin R.
Kester, Ronald Adetayo
Khan, Fehmida Mb
Khandheria, Manoj Pravin
Kiethanom, Mungkorn
Kim, Beum Saeng
Kimbleton, Dennis P.
King, Lonnie T.
Kivett, Gerald J.
Kleine, Michael L.
Knapp, Rebecca A.
Kneeland, John Fogg, Jr.
Koval, John Michael
Kuehl, Gary V.
Lacey, Hugh Lake
Lavallo, Patrick J.
Lazarus, Angeline
Lebenson, Bernard Stephen
Legasdi, Jane Peralta
Lehman, Thomas J. A.
Lemoncelli, Gary L.
Lentz, Meredith Rigdon
Leonard, Dale F.
Liu, Lawrence T. K.
Long, Ronald J.
Lubbers, Phillip Reid
Lyons, David C.
Mahoney, Michael D.
Maman, Arie Nmn
Manalaysay, Alvin Rene
Mangalindan, Ernesto Gaddi
Margel, Stephen Edward
Masters, Michael J.
Maxwell, James Houston
McClain, Gary M.
McClelland, Shearwood Junior
McDarby, James Vincent
McGreevy, Thomas Michael
McNulty, John S.
McPhate, Dennis C.
McPhee, Hugh T.
Meek, James M.
Meriwether, Michael Wells
Meshier, William Thomas
Metildi, Leonard A.
Michenfelder, Hans Jakob
Milan, Maria
Miller, George G.
Miller, Jeffrey E.
Miller, Larry K.
Miller, William I.
Mocnik, Jack Johnny, Jr.
Moore, Thomas H.
Morgan, Candice Ann
Moriarty, Richard Paul
Msuku, Cromwell P.
Myers, Thomas Edward
Naik, Sudhir Dhirubhai
Nauman, Steven S.
Navarro, Felix Angel, Jr.
Nelson, William Max, III
Newton, Cleveland Dave
Norris, Michael Stephen
Norvell, Samuel Strudwick, Jr.
Novak, Steve
Novelly, Norman J.
Obrien, William Francis
Olaisen, Arlene
Oldfield, Edward Charles, III
Osborne, Richard G.
Panagakos, Jean
Papp, Louis Anthony
Patel, Anilkumar R.
Patel, Devchand V.
Patel, Manojbhai P.
Patterson, Jeffrey David
Patton, Robert Clyde
Pearce Holton T.
Petruzzo, Robert Thomas, Jr.
Phillips, James Lee
Phillips, Richard B.
Pick, Robert Allan
Pineda, Rodolfo Liongco
Pitts, James R.
Powell, Jeffrey P.
Pruett, Richard Kepley
Quiles, Benjamin
Rameson, Robert F.
Ranbarger, Kim Robert
Rast, Philip Rentz
Rechtine, Glenn R., II
Reichley, Stephen C.
Reid, Mikell Robert
Richter, Joel E.
Ritter, Jack Lendon
Robinson, Philip Gavin
Rodrigues, Pablo Emilio
Rodrigues, Wilfredo
Rohr, William L., Jr.
Rowell, Donald Hooge
Roy, Dennis R.
Sabens, Charles H., Jr.
Salinas, Ana M.
Scharff, Norbert Daniel
Schmied, William Keller
Schuler, Michael A.
Scottcora, James William
Sharma, Suresht Paul
Sharp, Donald Alan
Sharp, Jimmy F.
Shaw, Spencer W.
Sheffield, Roger Whiteley
Shields, Robert J., III

Shumaik, George W.
Silverman, Eugene David
Simkovich, Joan
Singleton, Michael R.
Skye, Dorothy Virginia
Smith, Laurin Gresham
Smith, Richard G.
Steenbarger, John R.
Stelmach, Suzanne E.
Stevenson Craig Drinnan
Strong, Richard M.
Strosahl, Kurt F.
Sullivan, Michael T.
Sustarsic, David L.
Tarr, Jack Howard
Thane, Thane Toe
Thomas, John Richard
Thomas, Raymond Milton
Thornton, Yvonne Shirley
Timmcke Alan E.
Tomzak, Thomas Joseph
Torresstein, Paula M.
Tuli, Indra Thairiani
Vargas, Rodolfo Antonio
Wagner, Charles John
Wagner, Rosalyn Poole
Walden, Thomas E.
Wignall, Frank S.
Wiley, Arthur Sloan
Williams, Larry Scott
Wilson, Donald V.
Wolcott, Hugh Dixon
Woodruff, Carolyn Marie
Woods, Edward Lawson
Wurzbacher Terrie
Young, Robert Ellsworth, Jr.
Yurth, Daniel Allen

SUPPLY CORPS

Bailey, George A.
Boyarski, John Robert
Griffith, Paul D.
Haller, Brian Quinn
Johnson, Robert Channing
Lemburg, Myrl Lee
Luechauer, David Aaron
Lum, Calvin Hang
Maguire, Benedict Joseph
Marusak, Paul Steven
Miller, Robert B.
Ostrom, Ronald Gene
Pearson, Douglas Roland
Pretulak, Ronald Theodore
Putnam, Stephen Joseph
Rowland, Curtis A.
Stokes, David V.
Wagner, William Arthur
West, Michael Shannon
Young, Clement Clarke

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bebee, Roy L.
Burke, William Joseph
Caudill, Lee Edward
Cook, Raymond Williamson
Deney, Patrick Paul
Garrett, Thomas Clayton
Good, Raymond W.
Hines, Joseph W.
Maples, Robert Emerson
Metcalf, Merle Leroy
Milas, Theodore P.
Murphy, Kenneth J.
Nichols, Michael L.
Paul, George C.
Stith, Moses L.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Bromilow, Neil Frank
Hirsch, Lawrence Stanley

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Dorsey, William Arch, III
Fox, Victor
Montgomery, Ogden Knox
Picken, Cyrus Seeley, Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Bezdek, Donald J.
Elliott, Johnny Edward
Fishback, Niel Mark
Gustafson, Thomas Richard
Hamilton, Robert E.
Hickey, Martin Dan
Hill, Thomas Marshall
Kimble, Michael Keith
Kohlan, Douglas J.
Kozlik, Brain Lee
Mathis, Barry James
Moberg, Clifton Thomas
Olsen, Dearl Porter
Pankey, Eugene R.
Redmond, Arnold G.
Singer, Richard Jay
Weaver, William S.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Cash, James Edwin

NURSE CORPS

Benson, Teri Anne
Beto, Cathleen Anne
Boyle, Lynn Marie
Buehl, Eugene Joseph
Demaranville, Stephen E.
Dill, Sandra Ann Snow
Dix, Barbara Anne
Foley, Suzanne Lee
Francis, James Blake
Heresniak, Katherine
Johnson, Joelle Denman
Leiter, Georgene Sheary
Longuet, Karen Lee
Maxson, Mary Louise
McCain, Maureen Ann
McKenzie, Jean Darcy
Meriwether, Eileen Damelio
Muehling, Janet Marie
Parks, Mary Jane
Pate, Margaret Linn
Patusky, Kathleen Laura
Petrosky, Mary Ann Margaret
Schulte, Linda Ann
Sell, Helen Marie
Smith, Dorthie Stands
Stirk, Lawrence Donald
Thurston, Annie Wright
West, Anna Jane

IN THE NAVY

The following-named commanders of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

MEDICAL CORPS

Alston, Robert M.
Banda, Francisco P.
Berman, Samuel I.
Bright, Robert W.
Burrow, Rex L., Jr.
Clement, Gordon S.
Dennis, Charles H.
Drobocky, Igor Z.
Edwards, John P.
Eisenman, Lawrence S.
Geary, Brian D.
Hartmann, Robert G.
Hulon, Walter C.
Johnson, Paul E.
Johnson, William C., Jr.
Lewis, Robert B.
Lombard, Gabriel P. N.
Manhart, James W.
Martin, Alfred J., Jr.
McKinlay, Robert T., Jr.
Metz, Philip S.
Newcomer, Albert D.
O'Malley, Edward P.
O'Neil, William A.
Poundstone, John W.
Raymond, Lawrence W.
Ringer, James H., Jr.
Sanford, Harold W., Jr.
Sorensen, Vale H.
Stetz, Joseph A., Jr.
Uznanski, Kenneth M.
Wand, Oscar

SUPPLY CORPS

Bain, William D.
Bird, Jon A.
Blue, William A.
Breingan, Peter L., Jr.
Gough, Richard J.
Keane, Francis W.
Kopp, James E.
Moore, Douglas M., Jr.
Parsons, Stanley S.
Plein, Leonard A.
Schumacher, Jon R.
Sturhahn, David P.
White, Brents R.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bentley, Elder K.
Canniff, James B.
Current, Robert J.
Johnson, Edward D.
Johnston, James S.
Schofield, Calvin O., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Blanchar, James H.
Buckelew, Richard L.
Burks, Lawrence H.
Chiogioji, Melvin H.
Daniels, Joe E.
Lynch, Philip H.
Orange, Edward N.
Papez, James S.
Priest John E.
Rohde, Francis E.
Wacker, Arthur M.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Bonner, Walter J.
Hungate, Joseph W.
Lunney, James R.
Lynch, John J.
O'Brien, Keith G.
Stubbeman, David G.
Wollenberg, William L., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Cahan, John M.,
Pollard, John R.
Gomez, Edward
Ludwigsen, Lawrence R.
Martin, Lloyd R.
Perkins, Martin C.
Pudwill, Myron L.
Ronning, George A.
Silverman, Melvin
Smith, Edgar L.
Stark, Lawrence W.
Szatkiewicz, Richard J.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Haynes, Jack R.

NURSE CORPS

Armstrong, Margaret E.
Bahry, Vera J.
Komnenich, Pauline

The following named lieutenant commanders of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander of the staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

MEDICAL CORPS

Abram, Stephen E.
Abramczyk, Jerzy
Altenau, Lance L.
Antosek, Louis E.
Beall, Peter W.
Begelman, Kenneth M.
Belcher, George D.
Berger, Thomas J.
Blanco, Lucas J.
Bond, William R., Jr.
Boyer, Michael F.
Browder, Isaac W.
Buchholtz, Thomas W.
Buck, Loren L., Jr.
Castle, Charles A.
Chabala, James V.
Charneco, Jerry C.
Chikkappa, Gundabhaktha
Ciesla, William P.
Cramer, Harry R., Jr.
Crews, Eugene L., III

Culyba, Michael B.
Cummings, Robert J., Jr.
Davis, Leon J.
Dean, James
Delvecchio, Leonard M.
Derrington, Kenneth L.
DeSanctis, Carlos A.
Desmet, Arthur A.
Deweerd, James H., Jr.
Dollbois, John M.
Dorsey, Harry N.
Dwyer, Edward J.
Eckardt, Jeffrey J.
Fried, Gabriel
Friess, Carter C.
Furlow, Thomas W., Jr.
Fusch, Larry W.
Gaffney, Jon W.
Glenn, Johnny R.
Guzman, Nestor G.
Hacker, Philip K.
Hintz, Bruce L.
Hyink, Wendell J.
Jaeger, Scott H.
Junkin, Anthony B.
Khalil, Salah E. I.
Kiskaddon, Robert M.
Koh, James K.
Krishna, Sita G.
Krouse, Howard A.
Kurtz, Sanford R.
Lange, Thomas A.
Levy, Louis J., Jr.
Linsenmeyer, Charles M.
Lloyd, Douglas S.
Lowd, Edwin J.
Lozman, Jeffrey
Lutwick, Larry I.
Mackercher, Peter A., II
Maddalena, Michael A.
Maizel, David R.
Martin, John W., III
Mason, Miles H., III
Moss, Stephen A.
Nelson, Michael T.
Newman, Harry C.
Nimocks, James A.
Nordland, Robert A.
Noznesky, Nathan M.
Palley, Philip M. W.
Payton, Gladstone A.
Riley, Terrence L.
Rumans, Larry W.
Sauer, Thomas S.
Schwartz, Henry J. C.
Searle, Ryan S.
Seeds, John W.
Selinger, Samuel L.
Simon, David R.
Smith, Coral
Smith, Ronald A.
Stephens, Leo P.
Stone, John B., Jr.
Street, Thomas F.
Syre, Dudley A.
Thompson, Robert L.
Tur, Juan J.
Weidaw, Clark D.
Weihl, Albert C.
Wilcox, John R., Jr.
Williams, Alan L.
Zuromskis, Peter J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Baker, Richard B.
Bareuther, Robert H.
Bass, Malcolm E.
Beneke, John P., II
Birnbaum, Bernard I.
Bunting, Geoffrey C.
Burn, Richard H.
Butler, David A.
Casey, Danny G.
Cranfill, Jerry J.
Crawford, Edward C.
Delapaz, Dennis S.
Delucchi, Norman P.
Dittmann, Harry G.
Domino, Carl J.
Dove, Peter B.
Embry, Lloyd B.
Erdal, Dennis M.
Erickson, William V.
Eustis, Ernest L., III
Everett, Vernon M.
Flaherty, Keith L.
Fortin, Raymond F.
Freiberg, Gary C.
Gidman, Justin V., Jr.
Griswold, Stanley F.
Hagmann, Robert K.
Hatton, Robert G.
Henry, Robert F.
Hill, Richard A.
Hughey, Thomas M.
Hutchins, Richard A.
Ivey, Bruce D.
Jackson, John R., Jr.
Jacot, Jay F.
Johnson, Larry E.
Johnson, Russell C.
Jones, Gary J.
Kaegebein, Russ E.
Kammerer, Don M.
Kellar, Dennis L.
Kirstein, Philip L.
Klauber, Richard A.
Laney, Jeffrey G.
Link, William R.
Lorenz, William W.
Makarainen, Dennis C.
McCarthy, Brian N.
McCarthy, William D.
McReaken, David W.
Meyer, John H.
Moore, Roger D.
Northup, Paul R.
Obst, Anthony K.
Olchefske, Thomas L.
Pellicer, Charles E.
Piep, Herbert S.
Potts, John A.
Roberts, Clarence D., Jr.
Robertson, Francis G.
Ruckman, Hugh B., III
Schutte, Robert J.
Schwab, Donald E.
Seff, James M.
Smith, James M.
Sperling, Samuel J.
Tarantino, Frank L.
Teare, Harry B.
Thayer, James L.
Thompson, Robert W.
Tiernan, Harold S.
Trovaten, Benjamin A.
Venter, Josiah B.
Voronyak, Larry M.
Weissner, William W.
Wiles, Clarence D.
Wlaschin, David A.
Wright, Charles R.
Zezulka, Kenneth H.
Zwanzig, Peter E.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bourke, Charles E., Jr.
Bowers, Theodore E.
Chesser, Zane L.
Fisher, Herman E.
Forbes, Richard A., Jr.
Freeman, Sollace M., Jr.
Gean, Chesley B., Jr.
Herndon, William C.
Keenan, Patrick J.
Kilcoyne, Francis R.
Kraljic, John R.
Miller, Donald R.
Ramming, Michael E.
Shaft, Jearald J.
Wolbrink, Dean D.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Banta, Brent
Bennett, Eric R.
Bodine, Dale P.
Bogard, Burt, III
Brewer, Monroe F., Jr.
Briggs, Larry L.
Cole, Harry A., Jr.
Davis, Norman C.
Edwards, Christopher J.
Eilers, Carl W., Jr.
Evans, Lester G., Jr.
Garrigan, James T.
Goldman, Richard M.
Harby, Clifford N.
Johnson, Halvard T., Jr.
Kane, Raymond W.
Keithley, Claude A.
Loehr, Thomas G.
Mountjoy, John L.
Murphy, Aidan T.
Parker, Gregory A.
Parrish, Richard H.
Patterson, John W.
Picco, John J.
Polanski, Charles M.
Prahl, Charles S.
Reinhardt, Gregory C.
Scherman, Craig
Shelton, James E.
Sing, Charles T.
Small, James C.
Spence, Gordon D., Jr.
Spillinger, Ralph S.
Stapp, Richard R.
Wyatt, Burke.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Barker, Earl M., Jr.
Barnes, Woddrow H., II
Belser, Clinch H., Jr.
Coonrad, Douglas V.
Crabb, Joe F.
Cryan, Thomas M.
Daus, Donald E.
Dixon, Jerre W.
Eastwood, Myles E.
Gust, Robert P.
Hahn, Richard E.
Hynes, Marc G.
Kenoff, Jay S.
Kerr, Gerald L., III
Lassman, Bruce B.
Lawrie, William T.
Leigh, Edmond D.
MacDougall, Joseph
Miller, Brian K.
Navaretta, Stephen
Neidhart, Frank K., Jr.
Neuman, Kermit W.
Pezold, Robert K.
Powers, John E., Jr.
Principi, Antonio J.
Rader, Martin A., Jr.
Schetter, Carl J.
Soule, John G.
Walden, Gatewood A.
Ward, Edward F., Jr.

DENTAL CORPS

Abulafia, Lewis H.
Anderson, James B.
Deer, Edwin W., Jr.
Ellis, Michael V.
Estes, Ron
Freeman, Julian D.
Glore, James W.
Halstead, Arthur L., III
Johnson, James D.
Jones, Thomas L., Jr.,
LeClair, John W.
Marcello, Craig M.
Nilson, Lynn I.
Simmons, Richard F.
Spivey, Ernest G., Jr.
Timpe, Robert W.
Wirth, Michael J.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Cothran, Garland R.
Ferreira, Allen D.
Keudell, Kenneth C.
McCormack, Lawrence M., Jr.
Turner, Eugene R.
Zurcher, Louis A., Jr.

NURSE CORPS

Aylward, Lynn M.
Collins, Patricia M.
Coogan, Catherine M.
Cook, Marie D.
Dinino, Ann M. M.
Evans, Marilyn K.
Gangwer, Constance W.
Gartner, Anne, E.
Guise, Loretta M.
Harris, Maryann F.
Hugo, Maryanne
Janus, Cheryl A.
Jewett, Carole R.
Keller, Patricia J.
Learned, Charles E.
Lewis, Gayle Y.,
McCoy, Roberta M.
Mohning, Suzanne M.
Nation, Margaret J.
O'Donnell, Mary L.
Peterson, Francine F.
Rondeau, David B.
Shell, Barbara A.
Stagg, Judith S.
Welch, Katherine K.

In the Navy

The following-named temporary captains of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

Line

Chop, Raymond E.
Coyle, Francis X.
Jackson, Harry B.

Medical Corps

Barnwell, Grady G., Jr.
Brownlow, Bradley E.
Novak, Edward A., Jr.

The following-named temporary commanders of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

LINE

Clough, Geoffrey A.
Dyer, Bruce P.
Isenberg, Michael T.
Jackson, John D.
Jacobsen, James D.
Manning, Dennis B.
Pate, James W., Jr.
Poust, Roy N.
Rawls, Hugh M., Jr.
Robinson, Welford C.
Schubarth, Paul T.
Shepard, Donald W.
Verzino, William J., Jr.

MEDICAL CORPS

Carmick, Edward S.
Fine, Edward J.
Judman, Allen H.
Knudson, Robert D.
Krieg, Earl M.
Rozendal, Robert H.
Schwab, Charles W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bullock, James M.

DENTAL CORPS

Vinton, Jeffrey R.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Wheeler, John R.

In the Navy

Commander Bruce L. Bosworth, Dental Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, to be appointed a permanent commander in the Dental Corps of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Clyde H. Gunn, Jr., medical college graduate, to be appointed a permanent captain in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

William G. Pooler, ex-Naval Reserve officer, to be appointed a permanent captain, special duty (Merchant Marine, deck) in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Walter R. Felix, Jr., ex-Naval Reserve officer, to be appointed a permanent commander in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Charles W. Sellers, ex-Naval Reserve officer, to be appointed a permanent commander, special duty (Merchant Marine, engineering) in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

William H. MacFaden, U.S. Naval Reserve, to be appointed a permanent commander, special duty (Merchant Marine, deck) in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Commander Edwin R. Linz, U.S. Navy, to be appointed a permanent commander in the line in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

In the Navy

The following-named temporary commanders of the U.S. Navy and Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and various staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to section

611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Nichols, James R.

SUPPLY CORPS

Giffin, Donald H.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Wheeler, Matthew J.

The following-named temporary lieutenant commanders of the U.S. Navy and Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line, pursuant to section 6119a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law. 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Johnson, Charles C.
Schroeder, Kenneth R.

The following-named officers of the line and staff corps of the U.S. Navy, for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, as permanent lieutenants, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States code, section 531 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Evans, Richard T.
Favata, Alicia M.
White, David M.
Wities, Robert B.

In the Navy

The following-named temporary commanders of the U.S. Navy and Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Cumbie, James B.
Isenberg, Michael T.
Lapp, James W.
Waits, Wood D.

MEDICAL CORPS

Thompson, David H.

The following-named temporary lieutenant commanders to the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and various staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law (96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Allen, Charles E.
Altman, Kenneth B., Jr.
Anderson, Edward W.
Ascione, Raymond A.
Ashworth, Robert A.
Bassett, William T.
Bates, David G.
Bates, William A., Jr.
Beardin, Larry D.
Beck, Donald D.
Beck, Harold R.
Beck, Wayne A.
Beer, Bill E.
Bellflower, Robert J.
Bence, Rónald P.
Bledsoe, John R.
Borno, Louis M., Jr.
Brittain, William G., Jr.
Brown, John W.
Brown, Tommy A.
Burns, Daniel P.
Calhoun, Jimmy R.
Christensen, Erick T.
Combs, Charles R.
Combs, Russell W.
Conner, Roger A.
Cooper, Gary D.
Crooks, Dennis J.
Curry, Raymond M.
Dechene, Philip E.
Deese, David S.
Deneen, Brian M.
Dewald, Bruce F.
Dilick, Gregory P.
Dragone, Joseph A., Jr.
Duffy, Mark E.
Earnest, William G.
Enevoldsen, Jack
Evans, Gary W.
Fehrs, Thomas L.
Froemel, Anthony F.
Gann, Virgil E.
Garrison, Rolland R.
Glover, Andrew L.
Godfrey, Thomas J.
Goforth, George T.
Gordon, Harry J., III
Griggs, Edward C.
Gustin, Bruce A., III
Hahn, Raymond
Haller, Bernard J.
Harmer, Donald W.
Hawk, Bruce L.
Haworth, James R.
Henderson, Harold D.
Holcomb, William K.
Hurley, Lawrence E.
Hyatt, Jerry O.
James, Richard H.
Johnson, Paul R., Jr.
Jones, Preston L.
Kele, James E.
Keesling, Robert A.
Kilmer, Harold B., Jr.
Knight, Cletius D.
Knueppel, Wolfgang W.
Krueger, Lloyd E.
Kuhnert, Howard J., Jr.
Lamping, Edward W.
Landick, Richard E., Jr.
Locke, Edward S.
Lovett, Harry L.
Lovett, Joel D.
Lutes, Jack
Mares, Joe N.
Marshall, Rudy F.
Martin, Kenneth R.
McCollum, James W.
McCoy, Ernest V.
Mead, Willie J.
Miller, Edward L.
Mitchell, Kenneth R.
Moilanen, Thomas E.
Neal, Robert A.
Nice, Dan E., Jr.
Nolan, Carl W.
Olson, John T., Jr.
Oponick, William C., Jr.
Parks, James F.
Parsons, Walter P.
Pearl, John E., Sr.
Pease, Milton L.
Pfadenhauer, John J., Jr.
Pfuhl, John F.
Pierce, Billie J.
Power, Jerry R.
Price, Earl J.
Robinson, James E.
Robinson, Warren E.
Rowe, James F.
Rundberg, Edward E.
Ruth, Jack L.
Salinas, Amando S.
Schroeder, Kenneth R.
Sciuto, John J.
Seal, Warren G.
Sheehan, Leroy E.
Shipley, Thomas E.
Siegel, Allen R.
Smith, Howard P.
Solak, Lawrence E.
Spangler, Ralph G.
Stegeman, Ronald A.
Stowe, Abraham R.
Sweet, John L.
Thomas, Francis F.
Thompson, Robert M.
Trammell, David G.
Vaden, Don R.
Vanness, Henry A.
Walker, Charles R.
Westhoff, Dennis A.
Wetmore, Walter G.
Willard, Jimmy W.
Williams, Comer L.
Williams, George B.
Wilson, John E.
Wilson, Larry L.
Wilson, Millard J.
Wollam, Neil R.
Wood, Kenneth A.
Woods, Gerald B.
Worwetz, Harry J.

SUPPLY CORPS

Curry, Dennis S.
Fortier, Ormond L.
Randall, Bobby L.
Santonil, Rosendo T.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Law, George L.

The following-named officer of the line of the U.S. Navy, for appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps, as permanent lieutenant (junior grade), pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, sections 532 and 5582 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Saltsman, Robert R.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PROTECTING SENIOR CITIZENS AGAINST INFLATION

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, the ravages of inflation have hit us all, but none more than our senior citizens. Because our older citizens are, for the most part, on fixed incomes, it is important they take advantage of all allowable tax deductions, exemptions, and credits.

For this reason, I am submitting for the RECORD a revised checklist of itemized deductions for use in preparing Federal income taxes prepared by the Senate Select Committee on Aging. This checklist also highlights the changes in the tax code as a result of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

I hope our senior citizens will find this information useful in preparing their 1981 Federal income tax returns.

Form 1040 checklist is as follows:

PROTECTING OLDER AMERICANS AGAINST OVERPAYMENT OF INCOME TAXES

[A revised checklist of itemized deductions for use in taxable year 1981]

Who must file a Federal tax return is generally determined by your income and your filing status

You must file a return for 1981, even if you owe no tax:	*Income was at least:*
1. If you were single, divorced, or married with a dependent child and living apart from your spouse for all of 1981 and were:	
Under age 65	$3,300
Age 65 or over	$4,300
2. If you were married filing a joint return and were living with your spouse at the end of 1981 or on the date your spouse died and:	
Both were under age 65	$5,400
One was age 65 or over	$6,400
Both were 65 or over	$7,400
3. If you were married filing a separate return or married but you did not share the same household at the end of 1981	$1,000
4. If you were a qualifying widow(er) with a dependent child and:	
Under age 65	$4,400
Age 65 or over	$5,400
5. If you received any advance earned income credit (EIC) payments from your employer(s) during 1981.	
6. If you were self-employed and your net earnings from this work were at least *$400*, you must file a return to pay self-employment tax. You are self-employed if you carry on a trade or business as a sole proprietor, a member of a partnership, an independent contractor, or are otherwise in business for yourself. This includes certain part-time work that you do at home or in addition to your regular job. This rule applies regardless of your age; whether or not you are receiving social security benefits; and even if you are otherwise not required to file a Federal tax return.	
7. If income tax was withheld from your pay, you should file a return so that you can get a refund of the tax withheld, even if you are not required to file a return.	

ESTIMATED TAX PAYMENTS

Many newly retired people do not realize that they are often required to make estimated tax payments.

The pay-as-you-go feature of the Federal income tax system requires your employer to withhold income tax on compensation such as salaries, wages, and tips.

The same feature applies to your income that is not subject to withholding, or income from which not enough tax is being withheld. This includes income from self-employment, alimony, pensions, annuities, interest, dividends, rents, capital gains, and other income from which Federal income tax is not withheld. For these items of income you must file a declaration of estimated tax, Form 1040-ES, and pay the income tax and any self-employment tax estimated to be due.

Your estimated tax is the total of your expected income tax and self-employment tax minus your expected withholding and credits. Form 1040-ES provides a worksheet for making this computation.

If your estimated tax for 1982 is $200 or more and your estimated gross income not subject to withholding includes more than $500 of taxable income, you must file Form 1040-ES. Installment payments are due quarterly: April 15, June 15, September 15, and January 15.

You may be charged a penalty if you do not pay enough estimated tax. However, the penalty will not apply if you make each payment on time and:

(1) The payment is at least 80 percent of the amount of estimated tax due based on the tax shown on your return, or

(2) The payment is based on one of four exceptions shown on Form 2210, Underpayment of Estimated Tax by Individuals.

In order to avoid a penalty or paying estimated tax, you may have income tax withheld from your pension or annuity. You must fill out Form W-4P, "Pension, Annuity, or Sick Pay Recipient's Request for Federal Income Tax Withholding," and give it to the payer of your pension or annuity.

TAX TABLE AND EXEMPTIONS

Tax table

The tax table has been developed to make it easier for you to find your tax if your taxable income (line 12, Form 1040A; line 34, Form 1040) is less than $50,000. You must use this table unless you compute your tax using Form 4726 (maximum tax), Schedule D (alternative tax), or Schedule G (income averaging). In those cases, you must use the tax rate schedules. The tax table is designed to be used by individuals (other than those cases above) whether or not they itemize their deductions. This is possible because of an adjustment made on the Schedule A and an amount built into the tax table known as the "zero bracket amount." This flat amount based on your filing status provides a minimum deduction for all individuals. If you are married filing jointly or a qualifying widow or widower, your zero bracket amount is $3,400. If you are single or a head of household, your zero bracket amount is $2,300. If you are married filing separately, it is $1,700.

Exemptions

You are allowed a $1,000 deduction for each exemption shown on your tax return (line 6, Form 1040A; line 6e, Form 1040). You and your spouse are allowed an additional $1,000 exemption if either or both of you are age 65 or older on the last day of the tax year.

In addition, you or your spouse may be able to claim a $1,000 exemption for blindness (refer to your tax instruction booklet for more details on this exemption). Age and blindness are determined on the last day of your tax year. This is December 31 for most taxpayers. You are considered age 65 on the day before your 65th birthday. Thus, if your 65th birthday was on January 1, 1982, you can take the extra exemption for age for 1981. The $1,000 exemption is claimed on line 33, Form 1040 and on line 11, Form 1040A.

MULTIPLE SUPPORT AGREEMENTS

In general, a person may be claimed as a dependent of another taxpayer, provided five tests are met: (1) Support, (2) gross income, (3) member of household or relationship, (4) citizenship, and (5) separate return.

The support requirement is that the person claiming the exemption must have contributed more than one-half of the individual's total living expenses. But in some cases two or more individuals provide support for an individual, and no one has contributed more than half the person's support. However, it still may be possible for one of the individuals to be entitled to a $1,000 dependency exemption if all of the following requirements for multiple support are met:

(1) Two or more persons—any one of whom could claim the person as a dependent if it were not for the support test—together contribute more than half of the dependent's support.

(2) Any one of those who individually contribute more than 10 percent of the mutual dependent's support, but only one of them, may claim the dependency deduction.

(3) Each of the others must file a written statement that he or she will not claim the dependency exemption for that year. The statement must be filed with the income tax

---

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

return of the person who claims the dependency exemption. Form 2120 (Multiple Support Declaration) may be used for this purpose.

Note: You may include with your medical expenses those medical expenses you paid for a person for whom you meet the support test under a multiple support agreement, even if you may not claim the person as a dependent because he or she had gross income of $1,000 or more.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN FUND

You may voluntarily request that $1 of your taxes ($2 on a joint return) be paid into this fund to help pay for Presidential election campaigns. Checking "Yes" will not change the amount of tax you pay or the amount of refund you will receive.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

You may take a credit (line 38, Form 1040; or line 13A, Form 1040A) for campaign contributons to candidates for Federal, State, or local office, to newsletter funds and to political committees of candidates and elected public officials. The amount of the tax credit is limited to one-half of the political contribution, with a $50 ceiling ($100 for couples filing a joint return). You must have a written receipt to prove your contribution. Cancelled checks will, in most cases, meet the requirements for a written receipt.

CHECKLIST OF ITEMIZED DEDUCTIONS FOR SCHEDULE A (FORM 1040)

Medical and dental expenses

Medical and dental expenses are payments you make for the diagnosis, cure, relief, treatment, or prevention of disease. They also include payments for treatment affecting any part or function of the body. Expenses for transportation for needed medical care are included in medical expenses. Payments for insurance that provides medical care for you, your spouse, and dependents are included in medical expenses. Unreimbursed expenses are deductible to the extent they are more than 3 percent of your adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040). Expenses may be deducted only in the year you paid them. If you charge medical expenses on your credit card, the expenses are deducted in the year the charge is made regardless of when the bill is paid.

Insurance premiums.—One-half of medical, hospital, or health insurance premiums are deductible (up to $150) without regard to the 3 percent limitation for other medical expenses. The remainder of these premiums can be deducted subject to the 3 percent rule.

Drugs and medicines.—Medicines and drugs legally obtained and generally recognized as medicines and drugs are deductible. They do not have to be prescribed. These items are included in medical expenses (subject to the 3 percent rule) but only to the extent they exceed 1 percent of adjusted gross income (line 31, Form 1040).

Examples of unreimbursed medical and dental expenses. You can deduct the costs of:

Medicine, drugs, vaccines, and vitamins your doctor recommends.

Doctors, surgeons, dentists, eye doctors, gynecologists, chiropractors, osteopaths, podiatrists, chiropodists, psychiatrists, psychologists, physical therapists, acupuncturists, Christian Science practitioners, and psychoanalysts.

Medical examination, X-rays and laboratory services, insulin treatments, and whirlpool baths the doctor orders.

Nursing help. However, if you pay someone to do both nursing and housework, you can deduct only the cost of the nursing help.

Hospital care (including meals and lodging), clinic costs, lab fees.

Medical treatment at a center for drug addicts or alcoholics.

Medical aids such as hearing aids (and batteries), false teeth, eyeglasses, contact lenses, braces, orthopedic shoes, crutches, wheelchairs, guide dogs and the cost of maintaining them if you are blind or deaf.

Ambulance service and other travel costs to get medical care. If you used your own car, you can claim what you spent for gas and oil to go to and from the place you received medical care, or you can claim 9 cents a mile. Add parking fees and tolls to the amount you claim under either method.

Cosmetic surgery.

Cost and repair of special telephone equipment for the deaf.

Capital expenditures for medical purposes, such as air conditioning or elevators. If these expenses are for permanent improvements that increase the value of the property, you may include them as medical expenses only to the extent that they are more than the increase in the value of the property.

Cost of a nursing home (including meals and lodging) if the availability of medical care is a principal reason for being in the nursing home.

Medical care included in the "life-care fee" or "founders fee" of a retirement home which is paid monthly or as a lump sum under an agreement with the home. The deductible amount must be set apart for medical care.

Cost of special equipment, such as a motorized wheelchair or autoette, special hand controls and other special equipment installed in a car specifically for the use of a physically handicapped person.

TAXES

Real estate
General sales
State, local, or foreign income
Personal property

If the sales tax tables are used in arriving at your deduction, generally the only additional sales taxes you may add to the table amount are those you paid to purchase the following items: Automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, airplanes, boats, mobile homes, and material used to build a new home if the sales tax on the materials is imposed on you.

When using the sales tax tables, add to your adjusted gross income any nontaxable income such as social security, veterans and railroad retirement benefits, workmen's compensation, untaxed part of long-term capital gains, interest and dividend untaxed under the exclusion, interest on municipal bonds, untaxed part of unemployment compensation and public assistance.

INTEREST

Personal loan
Home mortgage
Auto loan
Loans on life insurance
Installment purchases

Bank and other general purposes credit cards.—Deduct the finance charge added to your monthly statement if no part of the charge was for investigation fees, membership fees, loan fees, service charge, or similar charges.

Points.—When buying a residence, "points" are interest paid in advance. You may deduct the amount you pay as points in the year of the payment—if the loan is used to buy or improve your principal residence and is secured by that residence. In addition, the payment of points must be an established business practice in the area where the loan was made, and the points must not exceed the number generally charged in this area.

If the residence you purchase is not your principal residence, you may not deduct the full amount for points in the year paid. Instead, the prepaid interest paid as points must be spread over the life of the mortgage, and it is considered "paid" and is deductible over that period.

Points are not deductible if they represent charges for services rendered by the lending institution (e.g., VA or FHA points are not deductible as interest). Also, points are not deductible if paid by the seller. These are selling expenses that reduce the amount realized.

Penalty for prepayment of a mortgage.—This is deductible as interest.

Revolving charge accounts.—These finance charges may be deducted if separately stated on your bill.●

PRESERVING NATIONAL TREASURES

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, in the next few days this body's attention will once again turn to consideration of budgetary matters. The threat of a high deficit and the accompanying need to control Federal spending will cause all of us to scrutinize each Federal program and appropriation to make certain that our precious dollars are wisely spent.

A recent article from the Wall Street Journal gives Congress some guidance about the proper way to maximize the purchasing power of our moneys. The Federal Government, through its land and water conservation fund, in the past has joined forces with the private sector to preserve priceless national treasures for generations to come. Private organizations are working hard to preserve unique areas for the use of all Americans. In the budget battles ahead, we must make certain that the Federal Government does not abandon this worthwhile effort. To leave these important preservation objectives to the overburdened private entities now struggling to be pennywise with their not unlimited funds would be a great mistake and a tragic loss for future generations.

I commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 6, 1982]

TRYING TO PROTECT THE PARKS . . . LEANING IN TEXAS? . . . PAST DUE

These are difficult times at the Trust for Public Lands. The Reagan administration has chopped funds for acquiring new national park and forest lands, a move that the trust feels is penny-wise but pound-foolish.

As a result, the trust, a San Francisco nonprofit corporation, is looking for new ways to protect the nation's natural treasures from development. Since 1972, the trust has acted as a midwife, arranging for the transfer of surplus corporate lands to various public agencies for parks, historic sites and wilderness areas. Overall it has transferred 38,000 acres in 16 states to public ownership. In the process, the trust has saved taxpayers money by selling the land to public agencies at prices averaging

24 percent below market value, a saving of about $12.1 million.

Here's an example of the trust's method: Development was encroaching on Point Reyes National Seashore in California, and a scenic buffer was needed. The trust was able to buy a 139-acre adjacent parcel for an amount equal to 52 percent of its market value. The trust did this by convincing the owner that the bargain price would allow him to shelter his capital gain and to reduce his income taxes through what amounted to a partial donation.

Because the trust got the land at a bargain price, it was able to pass the saving along to the National Park Service, which paid $450,000 instead of the appraised value of $795,000 for the land. (The trust kept $50,000 from the sale to help finance its activities.)

Now, however, the major source of money for purchases by the federal government, the land and water conservation fund, has been drained and the money shifted to the general treasury. Martin Rosen, president of the trust, says the shift will save the government some money. But he adds that it will force the nation to forgo protection for some unique areas or else pay more for them in the future.

"We're not cutting fat here," Mr. Rosen says. "We're cutting the legs off the park program. It's pseudo-economics."

The trust is looking for ways to protect wild areas. For instance, on Staten Island in New York, the trust is considering selling about three acres of a 14-acre parcel donated by a subsidiary of Aetna Life and Casualty. The proceeds of the sale would be used as an endowment to protect the remainder.

However, Mr. Rosen says there's no way corporate largesse can make up for the federal cuts.●

CREDIT UNIONS—SERVING THE ECONOMY WELL

HON. JAMES K. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. JAMES K. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, this week the National Association of Federal Credit Unions is holding its annual congressional caucus here in Washington. Thus, I would like to take this opportunity to point out to my colleagues the importance of Federal credit unions in our economy.

In general, 1981 was a very difficult year for many financial institutions. But credit unions have done a remarkable job overall in maintaining their positions and providing competitive savings rates and affordable loans to their members. This, of course, has a positive effect on the economy as a whole.

According to the latest credit union statistics from the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA), there are now 12,187 Federal credit unions in the United States, and over 26 million individuals belong to these institutions. Federal credit unions are chartered and regulated by NCUA. Savings at FCU's grew by $315 million in November 1981. Total assets of Federal credit unions at the end of November were $40.966 billion.

Many forecasters are predicting that funds will continue to flow into many Federal credit unions, especially those providing individual retirement accounts and other attractive savings programs. Credit unions have always been eager to serve their members, and in doing so have provided an important service to the economy as well.●

CLEANUP AT THE GSA

HON. GERALD B. H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, Paul Harvey is one of this country's most respected and popular commentators. He recently ran a commentary that sheds new light on one of the great stories of the Reagan administration—the cleanup over at GSA. As Mr. Harvey shows, all the news out of the bureaucracy is not bad; in fact Gerald Carmen's performance at GSA is such a success that I am surprised other commentators have not picked up on it.

The following is Mr. Harvey's commentary on the GSA. I commend it to you:

CLEANUP AT THE GSA

Our Government's General Services Administration is "supply sergeant" for all other government agencies.

Our government agencies, even as troops in the field, dare not outrun their logistics so the GSA is there to provide anything from paperclips to computers. Indeed the GSA administers 10,000 government buildings.

Not always well.

Until this administration moved into Washington a year ago the General Services Administration was generally maladministered.

Waste, fraud and abuse were so rampant that convictions ran into the hundreds, allegations into the thousands.

A hundred GSA employees were among those convicted.

And for every one who got caught, scores of others were suspected of hanky-panky ranging from waste to accepting payoffs from contractors.

An agency of government placing an order for supplies could expect to wait an average 30 days for deliver.

Understandably, employee morale around the muddied, bloodied and much maligned GSA was abysmally low.

And then six months ago there strode onto this scene a wiry little bespectacled man named Gerald Carmen.

He'd been a small businessman in New Hampshire, had built an auto supply store into a chain of auto supply stores, had been a frequent critic of the GSA.

And suddenly President Reagan said, "You run it."

Well, he's running it!

He borrowed a slogan from a World War Two poster: "Give it your best!"

This businesslike businessman walks fast, wears half-glasses, says things just once.

Carmen has employed in critical positions others of the GSA's critics and challenged each, "Now you do it better!" Steve Hammer of Goodyear, Charlie Davis of Ford, Bill Clinkscales and Bert Berube and Herb Koster.

He has moved up Jerald Fox and moved over from the White House Roger Dierman.

The six months metamorphosis is morale around the GSA has old Washington hands dumbstruck.

And in just six months contractors all up and down the line have re-learned circumspection.

Delivery time on warehoused material is down from thirty days to seven.

When government agencies were ordered to cut back, trim down, the GSA already had—reducing its own office space by twenty percent at a saving to you of 4.4 million dollars a year.

"The urgency of excellence" at GSA is just what the President ordered.

Mister Carmen, lead on!●

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE U.S. COAST GUARD

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement by the Coast Guard that budgetary constraints compel the termination of operations across the country and overseas angers and distresses me. I have, therefore, joined with the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, to introduce legislation providing funds to reinstate the operations affected.

For three Congresses I served as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation. Hour after hour, hearing after hearing, I heard the recurrent theme that the Coast Guard is seriously underfunded. Yet, despite the recommendations of the subcommittee for increased levels of funding for the Coast Guard, no relief has been given to this dedicated, yet beleaguered service. At the same time that the Congress was turning a deaf ear to the requests for additional funds, the Members of the two Houses were transferring more and more responsibilities to the Coast Guard. Something had to give. It has. If the reality of the cutbacks has not dawned on some people yet, it will, as the repercussions and ramifications come into sharp focus back home.

The Coast Guard is composed not of pencil pushers, but rather of operations experts, military personnel, and law enforcement officers. Their job is not to sit at desks and dream up new Federal programs or to dispense Federal funds. Their function is to promote safety to life and property at sea; to implement and enforce our drug and fisheries laws; to protect the marine environment; and, among other things, to assure the safety and security of vessels, ports, and waterways. As a military service, the Coast Guard must be ready to join forces with the Navy in times of national emergency or war.

The Service needs funding to continue these operations and to pay the people who conduct them. Included in the Guard's expenses are upkeep and maintenance of vessels, aircraft, vehicles, bases, and other equipment; the purchase of fuel for the vessels and aircraft; and, training costs. Originally, the Coast Guard requested operating expenses of $1.403 billion. Having dealt with the Service over these past years, I know that its requests are generally substantially less than it actually requires. Yet, the appropriations process yielded $46 million less than the Coast Guard believed minimally necessary.

This budgetary shortfall translates into a reduction of about 3,000 personnel; the decommissioning of 10 Coast Guard vessels; the closure of 20 search and rescue stations; the reduction in services for navigation aids, training, oceanographic research; and, the closure of vessel traffic service systems. Yet, these initial cutbacks in service, as severe as they are, will not solve the problem completely. These cuts will be followed by others, so that the Coast Guard can meet the appropriations level.

A number of closures are planned for my home State of New York. Among those are the termination of the Vessel Traffic Service. This system, while not yet fully operational, was providing an important safety service to the Port of New York, one of the busiest ports in our country. I am seriously concerned about the ramifications of this closure on the safety of vessels entering and leaving the port.

I wish that everyone would read the very excellent oversight report prepared by the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Navigation entitled, "Semi-Paratus" (H. Rept. 97-355). The findings reflect what those of us knowledgeable about the Coast Guard have known all along. The Service is doing the best job possible with what it has. What has been happening, of necessity, is that the Service has been fulfilling only part of its statutorily-imposed duties. As an example, it is achieving only 20 percent of its goal for interdicting the transport of illegal drugs by sea and only 38 percent of its goal for military readines training. The search and rescue program entered this decade with the same amount of personnel that it had at the beginning of 1970.

It is beyond me how we here in Congress can continually demand more service from the Coast Guard while turning our backs on them at appropriations time. The mere pittance we hand to the Coast Guard is shameful. We must pass this legislation—a life preserver to a service drowning in responsibilities.

SEA ISLE CITY

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, an important part of the district I represent in New Jersey is made up of seashore communities, which are not only home to thousands, but a beautiful vacation spot for visitors from around the country and throughout the world. One of the most popular resorts is Sea Isle City, a community which is about to celebrate its 100th anniversary.

Sea Isle City was founded in 1882 by Charles K. Landis as the New Jersey Cape's second seashore resort. Soon after returning from a trip to Venice, Italy, Landis became so impressed with the beauty of that city and its canals, that he envisioned Sea Isle City as another Venice. A number of canals and lagoons were built in his then "New City" which still provides beauty and pleasure for residents and guests alike.

This island town has long been the home of a large commercial fishing fleet, and is today one of the east coast's largest suppliers of lobster. The Sea Isle City of 1982 is renowned as "The Sea and Sand Vacationland," a warm and wholesome family seashore town whose location makes it an ideal vacation retreat. Its miles of wide, sandy and protected beaches, its clear water and clean invigorating air still offers the same allure to people as those attributes did 100 years ago.

Sea Isle City will celebrate its centennial with a summer-long festival of seasonal events, including a concert series, beach parties, and its annual surfing contest. The "Kick-Off" is a parade on May 22 to be hosted by the city's distinguished Mayor Dominic Raffa. The President of the United States, Ronald Reagan and New Jersey's new Governor, Tom Kean, have been invited. The festivities promise to be a fitting way to commemorate the founding of a beautiful city and its rich and enduring heritage.●

JAPANESE MEAT IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as this country continues to be subjected to an invasion of manufactured products from Japan, the American livestock producer suffers from the adverse impact of unfair trade restrictions on meat entering that country from the United States (a similar situation exists for American citrus producers.) The Japanese consumer craves the beef and pork which this country produces in such abundance, paying $18 or more per pound for prime American beef, and yet the Japanese Government places very stringent restrictions on the amount of these products which can enter the country. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the Congress and the administration immediately assign the highest priority to efforts to lift these unfair restrictions. To continue to allow the displacement of American manufactured products by those produced in Japan, and at the same time tolerate their restrictions on imports of our commodities, especially meat and citrus products, is grossly unfair to both the American farmer and taxpayers.

Yesterday I sent a letter to the President urging him to seek immediate redress on this issue, and I now urge the Congress to join with the administration its efforts to apply the necessary pressure to the Japanese, even to the extent of limiting the import of manufactured products from that country. These are harsh measures, but entirely justified when considered in the context of Japan's concept of free trade.

This issue was briefly, but sharply highlighted in a recent editorial published in the Norfolk, Nebr., Daily News, and I ask my colleagues to take a moment to read the views of a small newspaper which speaks so eloquently for the livestock producers of Nebraska and America:

[From the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News, Nov. 27, 1981]

LOOKING AT TRADE

The early November visit of 26 Japanese farmers to the Norfolk area to visit pork-producing facilities was a testimonial to the efficiency of this important segment of the livestock industry. As one of their spokesmen said of the United States, "this country is a good place to learn." And the Japanese are looking for ways to increase their efficiency, since it now imports large amounts of pork. It must also import much of the feed used to raise that pork. Ninety percent of such feed comes from the U.S.

Since there is a marked imbalance in trade with Japan, we would prefer to see them importing that feed in the form of finished pork and beef produced and processed by Americans.

This nation is matched by no other in the efficiency of its food production, and it could be made available cheaply to the Japanese consumer were there fewer barriers to this sort of trade along with realistic pricing for overseas shipping.

The nation does do well in terms of total agricultural trade. Exports are expected to be up 4 percent this year, to $45.5 billion. Agricultural imports will be around $17 billion. Of this total, only $3.6 billion is exported in the form of livestock products, including meat and hides. Yet meat is in short supply in Japan and many other countries of the world, including the developed nations which impose restrictions so their consumers must continue to pay two or three times as much, or five times as in the case of Japan, as Americans do. Protectionism in foreign agriculture comes at a high price for the overseas consumers.

With its limited land areas, it is doubtful the Japanese can compete at any time soon with Americans in grain and meat production.

It would be better for all if this were better understood and food trade restrictions lifted in order to compensate partially for the large amounts of finished goods which this nation purchases from Japan.●

SUPPRESSION OF FREEDOM IN POLAND SERVES TO REMIND AMERICANS OF OUR CHERISHED FREEDOMS

SPEECH OF

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 27, 1982

● Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 382 to permit the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film, "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity with the People of Poland." The suppression of freedom in Poland by the Communist rulers and the courage displayed by the Polish people serve to remind the Americans of the need to cherish our own freedoms and human rights. The film, normally intended for the millions who are unfortunately trapped in the captive nations of Eastern Europe, will be a vivid reminder to the American audience that the Polish people need our sympathy and prayers.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 382 should also send a signal to the Communist rulers of Poland and Russia that we do not condone or tolerate their dictatorial actions.●

ON THE SITUATION IN THE HORN REGION

HON. ARLEN ERDAHL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. ERDAHL. Mr. Speaker, the situation in the Horn of Africa remains unstable. Regional conflicts persist between Ethiopia and Somalia over the disputed Ogaden territory; civil war continues in the Ethiopian provinces of Eritrea and Tigray; the Soviet Union and Libya maintain their policies of adventurism and interference in Ethiopia and South Yemen.

All of these developments directly affect our country's vital interests in the Persian Gulf region.

I join my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. WILSON) in praising the administration for its resolute and prompt response this fall to the crisis in the Sudan caused by Libyan military threats. The extension of substantial economic assistance voted by Congress in December and the increase in FMS supplies contributed to the calming of political and military passions in Tripoli. Our legislative action also helped bring about the withdrawal of Libyan troops from Chad and their replacement by an OAU peacekeeping force.

We must recognize that the primary problem throughout the Horn of Africa is largely economic in nature. We need to direct the lion's share of our aid into economic and humanitarian assistance. Somalia has the largest number of refugees in the world and we cannot ignore the inability of the Somali Government to provide even the basic human needs.

In fiscal year 1982, the United States increased development assistance to Somalia only slightly. It is imperative that additional funds be allocated for feeding the refugees and providing them with some cottage industries if peace is to be preserved. I hope the administration and Congress will work together this session to accomplish this vital task.

The United States must also recognize Somalia's defense needs. Last Friday night, I met with the Somali Defense Minister in Washington and discussed the security interests of his country. It is evident Somalia faces a real threat in the buildup of Soviet, East German, and Cuban military forces in neighboring Ethiopia.

In the future we must not ignore Somalia's defense needs while recognizing that the most effective way to contain foreign military presence is to strengthen the economies of our friends in the Horn of Africa.●

NICARAGUAN WOMEN: EQUALS IN BATTLE, TRYING TO BE EQUALS IN HOME

HON. SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the evolving roles for women in postrevolutionary Nicaragua are discussed in the January 11 edition of the New York Times. During the war, Nicaraguan women played a major role in the successful overthrow of the Somoza regime. In some fighting units their participation was as high as 30 percent. Although equals on the battlefield, they are waging a difficult fight at home for women's rights.

Even though Nicaraguan women do not consider themselves feminists in the American sense, societal changes indicate that advocacy for equal rights and improvements in status for women has been very successful. Some of the new changes for women are secured through revisions in discriminatory laws, altering of stereotypes and public education. For example, no longer are fathers given absolute legal rights over their children; no longer can a father not regularly support his family.

Nicaragua is beginning to show how undeveloped countries are redefining the roles of all of its citizens. Nicaraguan women are demonstrating that they can make viable contributions as liberators, politicians, mothers, or whatever roles are needed for their country's survival:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1982]

NICARAGUAN WOMEN: EQUALS IN BATTLE, NOT IN HOME

(By Warrenhoge)

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA.—Garrisons of Gen. Anastasio Somoza Debayle's National Guard were falling to the Sandinist insurgents all across Nicaragua in the closing days of the war, but the commander in the southwestern town of Diriamba still held out.

It wasn't bravery that motivated him. He insisted he couldn't hand over his arms to his Sandinist counterpart because she was a woman. He said he would surrender only to her male second-in-command.

Commandante Monica Baltorano prevailed in the end, and other fortresses of Latin male prerogative have been crumbling in Nicaragua ever since.

Female participation in some of the Sandinist fighting units was as high as 30 percent, and the country's second largest city, Leon, was captured and later run by a military command of five women. "We make up more than half the population, and without us there would have been no revoution," said Magda Henriques, director of international relations of the Luisa Amanda Espinoza Association of Nicaraguan Women. The group is named after the first woman to have been killed in combat during the guerrilla war that deposed General Somoza.

Once the war ended two and a half years ago, many of these women were unwilling to return to the lives that Nicaraguan tradition had reserved for them. Today their new role is being secured through revisions in discriminatory laws, altering of stereotypes, and public education; there may even be an incipient change in notions of domestic duties.

Though the women's movement now occupies a noncontroversial place in the revolutinary process, it had a beginning full of conflict. Many women returning to husbands immediately after the war battled to maintain the equality they had won in the field, and a large number of divorces resulted.

"For a lot of other men, it was fine for all women to get involved in the revolution as long as it wasn't their wife," said Mrs. Henriques.

More than half the members of the militias the Sandinists are now training are made up of women, and every major city has at least one women's battalion of reservists who drill 30 days a year, one weekend a month and two nights a week.

Emma Tinoco, a political instructor at the training field in the town of Tipitapa, said "the great majority" of them encountered no difficulty taking time off from the home. "Some of them," she added, smiling, "have had to convince their husbands of, shall we say, 'their historic mission.'"

Radio Sandino has focused on the situation in its daily soap operas. In one, a man returns home from work to find that his wife has gone off to do militia training and left dirty pots in the cooking area. He curses her, stomps out of the house and gets drunk at a neighborhood bar.

LECTURE ON RESPONSIBILITIES

Later, back at home, he finds his wife returned and gives her a boozy lecture on her household responsibilities. She calmly tells him of her responsibilities to the revolution, and the final chapter finds him apologizing and admitting his error.

The revolution is trying to combat a long-prevalent tendency among peasant men to have more than one family, give none of them regular support but, on their sporadic appearances, expect from all the respect due the head of a household. The Government has set up an office that tracks down itinerant fathers and forces them to make payments to their wives.

In a speech addressed to "brother workers and peasants," the Minister of Planning, Henry Ruiz, said, "I beg your pardon for being so blunt, but you will have to get drunk less and dedicate more of your salary to your family."

The women's group does not use the word "machismo" in its rhetoric, and the members do not like to call themselves feminists. Both terms to them have a bourgeois ring, a woman who works for the Sandinist Front said.

Mrs. Henriques witnessed the American women's movement while studying at Temple University, but her recollection of it is selective and negative. "Ours isn't a feminist movement that is in struggle against men like in the developed countries," she said. "We're not interested in taking our bras off, learning how to drink like men or proving we can have as many affairs as they can."

AN UNFAVORABLE REACTION

That terminology does, however, play a role had been evident days earlier at the annual gathering of the women's organization. When Mr. Ruiz, in a speech, extolled the Sandinist women as the "delicate" part of the revolution, he was greeted with studied glares from the three fatigue-clad female commanders on the stage with him.

On several occasions, those eager to change old habits have been too zealous. Tomas Borge Martinez, the Minister of the Interior, once suggested that men should start doing housework. "That is an idea that is a long way off for working-class people," Mrs. Henriques said. "It's different because you're really talking about an ideology. That will take years and years of work."

The women's group, she said, is devoting its efforts instead to promoting domestic work as "a valuable social contribution" and acquainting mothers with proper health care for their families. It is also setting up day-care centers and rehabilitative training for prostitutes, some of whom are as young as 13.

The women's group itself got too far ahead of community norms when it proposed creating a committee to rule in child custody cases where separating parents were "of similar quality." When the national legislature, known as the Council of State, balked at the idea, the measure was returned to neighborhood committees for restudy. "We were proved wrong," she said. "It turned out that people felt that in such, situations mothers should be favored over fathers."

The constitution has been stripped of all clauses considered discriminatory, and a law that gave fathers absolute legal right over their children was abolished. A new law banning the "commercialization" of women was passed. "You can't sell beer and tires anymore with women's legs," Mrs. Henriques said.

The younger generation of women in Nicaragua are prepared to continue the campaign, according to Mrs. Henriques. "I don't even have to teach my daughters," she said. "They grew up seeing their mother walking around with an M-16 over her shoulder, and they already dream of being members of the militia."●

REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Schweiker's proposal to reduce the present 36-month eligibility period for refugee assistance to 18 months is illadvised. These proposed changes in eligibility regulations, published December 11 in the Federal Register, afforded little time for congressional comment before the January recess. Fortunately, protest from the other body has effectively postponed any reduction in the eligibility period until March 1982. I urge my colleagues to express their concern on this issue during the interim period.

In Washington State, the impact of reducing the eligibility limitation period to 18 months will be felt with crippling effect. According to Washington State's Department of Health and Social Services, cash and medical assistance will be terminated for 43 percent of the State's current recipients—equal to 3,793 cases or 9,141 persons. Assuming this proposal goes into effect in March, 11,500 refugees will be cut off from receiving Federal assistance by September of this year.

In Washington State, there are no State assistance programs to supplement or substitute for a reduction in Federal funding for refugee cash and medical assistance. Washington State's general assistance program is restricted to cases of unemployment disability. The State's aid to dependent children fund only provides for single parent households. It is doubtful that any additional refugee assistance funds can be appropriated on the State level considering Washington's financial problems and high unemployment. If the 18-month eligibility proposal is implemented, refugee families in the State of Washington will be forced to either split up to comply with State AFDC requirements or move to a State such as California which does provide general assistance funds for refugees. Even the strong community network of Washington State volunteer agencies, refugee mutual assistance associations, churches, and food banks will be unable to compensate for reductions in assistance brought about by this proposal.

According to calculations made by the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, 30 percent of the administration's entire budgetary savings resulting from a reduction in the eligibility limitation period will come from terminating cash and medical assistance for refugees in Washington and Oregon. This is an unfair share of the financial burden to impose on a State such as Washington, which has been dedicated to effectively resettling, educating, and employing 31,000 refugees. Washington's is the largest State refugee population in the country. Forcing refugees out of States which have become their home to seek financial assistance in new areas disrupts families and communities without guaranteeing budgetary savings to the Federal Government.

The following policy options should be considered before Secretary Schweiker's proposal to reduce the eligibility period to 18 months is allowed to go into effect:

(1) Refugee single-parent families, two-part families, and childless couples should all receive Federal cash assistance for 24 months; 18 months would not allow a reasonable time for developing self-sufficiency.

(2) All refugees should receive medical coverage a full 36 months, regardless of their eligibility for other forms of Federal assistance. This would insure that health care would be provided for refugees having a difficult time adjusting or finding employment.

(3) The present State eligibility formula used by the Office of Refugee Resettlement for determining State allocation of Federal assistance funds should be adjusted to reflect secondary migration of refugees from one State to another, as part of a State's total refugee population.

In conclusion, I must remind my colleagues that the Refugee Act of 1980 was based on the congressional consensus that a full 36-month refugee assistance program was essential to provide the basic educational and social training necessary for refugees to communicate and find employment within this society. If, due to budgetary restraints, Federal assistance for refugees must be reduced, it should be done as humanely as possible. Reducing the 36-month eligibility period to 18 months, without compensating States that do not receive Federal funds for general assistance programs which include refugees as eligible recipients, will only work to displace a large number of refugees and their families without providing a real solution to this complex problem.●

THE MEDIA—AND RICHARD ALLEN

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, during the course of recent months, I have had occassion to have some contact with President Reagan's former National Security Adviser, Richard Allen.

I am aware of Dick Allen's tremendous talents, his special knowledge of the Orient, and of our critical position in world affairs.

The vindication of Dick Allen appears to me to have been complete—leaving no blemish on his character or reputation. However, the treatment which Dick Allen has received at the hands of the media has resulted in a perception of Dick Allen which makes his removal from his post as National Security Adviser understandable.

The media portrayal of Dick Allen and its consequences for Dick Allen's otherwise prominent career is described in an eloquent commentary by Tom Braden. Tom Braden's piece, which appeared in the Thursday, January 7, 1982, edition of the Washington Post, is attached for the edification of my colleagues and for the thoughtful study of those media representatives who come in contact with these pages.

THE CHURLS OF THE PRESS

(By Tom Braden)

Richard Allen was telling me the other day about his treatment at the hands of the press, and as I was listening I found my mind going back to that night in June of 1968 when Robert Kennedy was shot.

I've forgotten how my wife and I happened to take temporary custody of two Kennedy children that evening. Emotion blurred the memory of events as fast as events took place.

At any rate, there we were in a cottage on the hotel grounds, and we were very careful to engage our charges in conversation and not to let them turn the television on.

After a while the telephone rang and somebody who was with Mrs. Kennedy asked us to bring the children to her. I remember well what happened when we opened that cottage door.

Flashbulbs popped. Men clambered out of bushes, shouting at the children: "How do you feel about your daddy being shot?" "Which one are you?" "Have you prayed for your daddy?"

That was the way those children heard the news.

I remember being so angry as we hastened down a sidewalk to a car that, stupidly, I tried to take a swing at a cameraman, though I was carrying a child in my arms. But I also remember being ashamed. These men were reporters. Yet here they were reducing themselves to the level of purse snatchers, second-story men, child abusers.

And though I don't mean to compare the ordeal of Richard Allen with that of the Kennedy family, it seems to me that in both incidents the question to be asked is "why?"

Why did reporters do what they did to those two children? Why did they stand outside Richard Allen's house, climb trees to look into his windows, dump their half-eaten sandwiches and paper cups all over his lawn and follow him to a restaurant, listen to his conversation and inquire of the proprietor as to whether he had paid his bill?

I have asked this question of my coleagues in print, television and radio, and they answer as one: "If we didn't stake Allen out, somebody else would. If one Los Angeles newspaper had not staked Kennedy kids, some other paper or TV station would have, and if one got a story or a picture and the other didn't there'd be hell to pay."

In short, so I am told, competition is what turns gentlemen into churls.

I do not think this a sufficient answer. I know many a newspaper publisher, many owners of television and radio stations. I know the heads of the three major networks. Not one of them would be caught dead peering through somebody's window, abusing a child or dumping garbage on a lawn.

Then why do they permit these deeds to be done in their name?

Some owner of a network or a chain of newspapers is going to wake up one morning and say, "This has gone far enough. I'm going to propose a code of ethics for my profession and a watchdog to enforce it and we're not going to do this sort of thing any more."

Or am I mistaken?

Isn't there anybody out there in an ownership position who is possessed of guts?●

HAIL TO THE ITALIAN POLICE FOR THEIR WORK IN RELEASING GEN. JAMES DOZIER

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. **BIAGGI**. Mr. Speaker, I know the elation that I feel over today's release of Gen. James Dozier is shared by my colleagues and millions of others in this Nation. It is appropriate for us to pay tribute for all those responsible for this extraordinary achievement—first and foremost the exemplary members of the Italian police who conducted the raid which freed General Dozier, the Italian Government must be saluted for the incredible commitment they made to insure that the full powers of law enforcement were used to secure the general's release. Further, the ongoing cooperative arrangements between our two Governments was critical to the successful outcome we are enjoying today.

I was a police officer for 23 years in the city of New York and consequently feel that I know good police work when I see it. What the Italian police achieved was nothing short of a miracle. The Red Brigade long known for their ability to baffle police has endured a tremendous setback, one which we hope can be translated into an overall setback for all terrorism.

The Italian police cracked a wall that was seemingly impenetrable. They deserve the highest praise from a grateful America. To General Dozier we send out best wishes and commendation for being a great American. We share the joy of his wife and daughter but above all we are grateful to the Italian police and Government for their invaluable work.

At his point in the RECORD let me insert a telegram I have sent to Ambassador Maxwell Rabb:

JANUARY 28, 1982.

Hon. MAXWELL RABB,
Ambassador,
American Embassy,
Roma, Italia.

DEAR AMBASSADOR RABB: I would like your assistance in contacting the members of the Italian Special Police who were responsible for the release of Brigadier Gen. James L. Dozier early this morning in Padua. I would personally like to invite these courageous officers to the United States—New York City and Washington, D.C.—in order to pay tribute to their courage and valor in rescuing Dozier and capturing the terrorist members of the Red Brigade.

Regards,

MARIO BIAGGI,
Member of Congress.●

TRIBUTE TO SOUTH OAKS HOSPITAL FOR ITS CENTENNIAL

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. **DOWNEY**. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress the South Oaks Hospital had already been serving the afflicted of Long Island for more than three quarters of a century. In this country of great flux and change, there are not many things aside from government that have endured for more that 100 years.

I want to pay tribute to this hospital in my congressional district that has been in existence continuously and successfully since 1882. South Oaks Hospital was a leader in the treatment of emotional disorders in the early years, and has remained preeminent among psychiatric hospitals to this day.

South Oaks Hospital, organized as a corporation for the treatment of "nervous disorders" in 1882 on the same site it is today, has become in recent years one of the principal facilities in the United States for the diagnosis and treatment of the problem of alcoholism. Although it is a private hospital, it presently offers over 3,000 "free" patient days per year to various agencies. It maintains as a community service 23 alcohol clinics per week having over 12,000 visits per year, a speakers bureau, conferences and affiliations with almost every major college and university in the metropolitan area.

In addition, South Oaks is one of the principal employers in southwestern Suffolk, having 449 full-time employees and 238 part-time employees.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the officers and skilled personnel of the South Oaks Hospital, who, by their diligence and sense of responsibilitiy, have helped so many thousands of people over the past hundred years.●

TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR SEGREGATED PRIVATE SCHOOLS

HON. NORMAN Y. MINETA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. **MINETA**. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's recent "ambivalence" over his position on the tax status of racially discriminatory private schools exemplifies the shocking lack of concern for the rights of the minority citizens of this country which has come to typify this administration.

Mr. Reagan has stated that he is not a racist and that his intention in revoking the long-standing IRS policy of denying tax-exempt status to private schools that discriminate on the basis of race was merely to prevent agencies such as the IRS from exercising powers the Constitution assigns to Congress.

First of all, if the President had done his homework he would have discovered that the IRS policy was not an usurpation of the power of Congress but was instead mandated by Congress when it passed title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibiting racial discrimination in federally assisted programs. If Mr. Reagan had any doubts that title VI prohibits the Federal Government from granting tax-exempt status to racially discriminatory schools, further research by the President would have lead to the discovery that the U.S. Supreme Court has affirmed that this is indeed the case. Furthermore, even if one accepts the President's rationale that he believes, despite title VI and Supreme Court affirmation, that the IRS did not have the congressional mandate to carry out its regulations, it is difficult to understand why the President did not immediately offer legislation to specifically redress this alleged jurisdictional problem rather than wait until public outcry forced his hand.

I urge my colleagues to quickly resolve this unnecessary debate and send the message to the President that our Constitution already guarantees that all citizens of this country are entitled to equal protection under the law and that it is and will continue to be the President's duty to enforce the Constitution.●

AN URGENT MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues may have seen an open letter to the President and the Congress which was placed as an ad in major newspapers several days ago. The author, Alfred Roach, is chief executive officer of TII Industries, a firm based on Long Island and in Puerto Rico.

In his letter, Mr. Roach discusses the steps it will take to restore the pre-eminent industrial power of the United States and allow us to compete more effectively with other nations, most notably Japan. I commend Mr. Roach's letter to those who may have missed it:

AN URGENT MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dear Mr. President: Fear! Not since Franklin D. Roosevelt told our nation, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself", has fear gripped so many of our people. We Americans responded to President Roosevelt's remarks with deep faith and great determination. We built the mightiest industrial and military complex known to man. And we went on to victory.

WAR WITH JAPAN—THEN AND NOW

Four decades ago we went to war with Japan, following "the day of infamy" at Pearl Harbor. Today we are again at war with Japan—this time an undeclared economic war—and the outlook is grim. I am not against Japan's prosperity. But I am outraged that it is *they* who are prospering at *our* expense; especially when we consider Japan's broad economic programs; organizing government, industry, labor, education and banking with the objective of full employment for the Japanese people. At the same time, our Government appears bent on destroying our economy. We have nine million, four hundred thousand unemployed people. Japan has virtually none.

JAPAN'S STRATEGY

Japan does not hide its strategy for winning the economic war. It is reported to us in newspapers, magazines and on the air waves. Thank God for our free press. Without it, most of us would be unaware of the catastrophe upon us. The Japanese interviewed by *Business Week* (December 14, 1981) have revealed their plan for a takeover of Western markets in the 1980's. If you have not already done so, Mr. President, we urge you and the members of Congress to read the *Business Week* article, "Japan's Strategy For the '80"s.

THE AMERICAN WAY

The American economy today does not have a chance in head-on competition with the Japanese. Why? Because the Japanese society—government, banking, labor, education—supports business, in every way. In the United States, business and labor have become the target of society—a target of our government through archaic and repressive legislation, of a monetary policy which imposes impossible rates of interest. Some of the very policies—designed to protect American industry from unfair practices—destroy us when we deal internationally. These laws enable other countries to take our technology with impunity. This situation, coupled with the Japanese Government's subsidies and business support, puts American industry on the road to bankruptcy.

JAPAN, AT&T, IBM AND THE AUTO INDUSTRY

Never would the Japanese government have permitted the dismemberment of AT&T, the best communication system in the world; a company which took 100 years to build. A company, which, with its dedicated management and employees, and its technological contributions has contributed so much to the growth and greatness of America. Our government harassed IBM in court for thirteen years, causing incalculable damage, and has now found the case to be without merit. Japan would never try to cut the heart out of a successful business. If this anti-business trend continues, our auto industry will be gone to Japan within three to five years, with 20 percent of the American work force directly affected . . . their strategy also calls for the takeover of the computer and communications industries in the 1980s.

JAPANESE EDUCATION VERSUS AMERICAN EDUCATION

I understand, Mr. President, that for every 1,000 engineers graduated from Japan's universities, there are 100 law school graduates. In the U.S.A., for every 1,000 engineers, there are 10,000 lawyers graduated. I also understand there are 40,000 lawyers in all of Japan. In the U.S.A., a recent tally indicates we have 480,000 lawyers. How do they exist? The answer—corporations, government regulations, audits, reports, taxes, legislation, litigation and bankruptcy. This adds great costs to our economy, eventually to products and services mounting to billions a year.

Public accounting firms (Congress legislated them into prominence by enactment of the Securities and Exchange Act in 1933–34) provide the mandated audits of corporate financial reports. In 1980, fees of only eight major accounting firms added $6 billion to the corporate cost of doing business.

The public accounting firm that audits General Motors reportedly assigns a team of 1,400 accountants, spread through offices around the world, for the field work. This team alone, according to Mark Stevens in his book, The Big Eight, is larger than 99 percent of all of the accounting firms in the world. This cost is reflected in the cost of GM cars. Japan has no such legislation. Every government regulation adds to every product cost. Interstate Commerce Commission rulings for one year alone, required 57,027 pages of fine print in the Federal Register. Currently, U.S. business spends over $120 billion annually to complete paper work required by the government. It is not that I am against lawyers and accountants. I believe that their talents can be redirected toward constructive work to help us to rebuild this nation.

ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

Mr. President, if anyone had told me a decade ago that my small company TII, (with annual sales of $21 million) would have more pre-tax income than four of the largest automobile companies, I would have laughed them out of my office. Our good fortune is due in part to the government of Puerto Rico and to our high technology, "quality award" winning, highly productive and creative labor force. The government there has developed an enlightened tax policy—a tax moratorium to companies locating there—to strengthen the Puerto Rican economy. As you so eloquently told us in 1980, "These loyal Americans have proved themselves in every war since 1898", and, Mr. President, they know how to fight this one.

You may know, Mr. President, the little town of Toa Alta in Puerto Rico. In 1974, 30 percent of the population of that town was out of work. The Commonwealth Government gave us every encouragement to locate a factory there. We began with 20 people and now, seven years later, over 450 people are working in that factory. They pay taxes, have savings accounts, buy homes and cars, and send their well-fed happy children to school. This economic success story can be repeated throughout the United States of America.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

Many of our fellow Americans express a growing feeling that nothing can be done to reverse this tide and that we will become a colonial dependency of Japan. I do not agree. Something can be done, Mr. President. Let us put partisanship aside. We must move boldly and quickly to remove from business and agriculture the restrictions and regulations that are bankrupting them. Help us to get back to where we were with free enterprise—the enterprise that built this nation in 175 years from a backwoods frontier to the wealthiest and most charitable nation in the history of mankind. Trust the people. Bring us together. There are 226,504,825 Americans, rich in bright intellect from every race and culture in the world, who have one thing in common, the love of freedom. It is freedom which inspires creativity and productivity. Send out the call for the dollar-a-year man and women. We are still here—ready, willing and able. We have the know-how and the patriotism and I believe, we have some of the answers. We look forward to the day when government, labor, banking, industry, agriculture and education will again work together for the full employment of our people.

May I express admiration and gratitude, Mr. President, for your leadership and the cooperation you have received from our Congressmen. We need their understanding and their help in this fight for survival and the right to be free. Talk to us, Mr. President. Give us the needed inspiration and leadership. Then, God willing, the people of this once most powerful nation will waken Uncle Sam to flex his economic muscles and rise again to greatness.●

THE EXPENSE ACCOUNT TAX BONANZA FOR CONGRESS: A SAD MISTAKE

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, the heavy public condemnation which has greeted the new income tax deductions to be allowed Members of Congress for Washington, D.C., living expenses is certainly deserved. I consider the secretive method used to enact this special deduction to be especially damaging to the Congress. It was spirited through this Chamber without advance notice, without proper committee hearings, without serious debate, and without a rollcall vote as an obscure amendment to another bill. Such an unconscionable procedure throws a dark cloud over the reputation of the U.S. Congress.

It may well be, there is a need to increase the $3,000 limitation on Washington, D.C., living expenses which was enacted in 1952. In the 30 years since, inflation has caused the limitation to seem unrealistic. I believe the American people appreciate the fact that Members of Congress receive no special allowance for their living expenses here in Washington, D.C. We expend our own personal resources for this purpose, and, in every case, the cost far exceeds $3,000 per year. Certainly we ought to be permitted to deduct a reasonable portion of these expenses on our individual tax returns.

But any increase in the deduction for living expenses should have been subjected to the same thorough scrutiny of committee hearings and floor debate that we give to other tax legislation.

Those of us who opposed this ill-advised action were nearly successful in attempting to overturn it as the first session ended. I hope that in this new session the House leadership will agree to an opportunity for this Chamber to review this unfortunate action and to eradicate an undeserved stain on the reputation of the 97th Congress.●

THE DISMANTLING OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, from special programs for disadvantaged children to support for research in our institutions of higher education, the erosion of our country's educational system is taking place. The vital link between economic and social progress and education is being sacrificed in the name of cost effectiveness by this Nation's leadership.

I have received a letter from David M. Brown, M.D., professor of laboratory medicine, pathology, and pediatrics at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, and chairman, Council of Academic Societies Association of American Medical Colleges, in which he outlines this disturbing trend. I urge my colleagues' serious consideration of Dr. Brown's remarks as we consider proposals for further cutbacks and revisions in the structure of education programs. His letter follows:

> The dismantling of the educational system of the *United States* at federal, state and local levels, is occurring at an accelerating rate, and is a cynical indictment of the nation's leaderships perspective of our future. At a time when international trade and competition have become mainstays of economic strength and when the United States must undergo major reindustrialization, the structure upon which this major thrust must depend is being undermined.
>
> It is widely recognized by economists and industrialists that long-term success of the United States in retaining its role as the world's industrial leader is dependent upon the accelerated development of major scientific thrusts. It is an uncontested fact that the vast majority of major initiatives which lead to industrial breakthroughs occur within our educational institutions. Yet we are experiencing major cutbacks at all levels of support for education. We are seeing the elimination of the nation's partnership role in research but, even more damaging, are destroying the education of the children who would be the sources of our innovations and creativity.
>
> The nations with which we hope to compete economically, such as Japan and Germany, recognize the vital links between education and their economies and are encouraging and supporting the development of partnerships between educational institutions and industry. They have recognized the long lead time and broad base of knowledge necessary to assure the evolution of strength of their economies. The increasing numbers of basic and applied scientists being trained by those nations attests to their commitment to their future strengths economically and politically. Furthermore less developed nations such as China and nations of the Middle East also have seen the value of encouraging these relationships and are building their educational systems to assure their primacy in industrial competition. The feeble efforts of the United States to achieve this goal by tax incentives to private industry while decreasing direct support to institutions of higher education will not be successful. Direct government participation in financial support is crucial.
>
> At the same time as these advances are being made by other nations, the United States is becoming increasingly oriented to a "cash flow" orientation. This mentality is pervading our entire society. Government looks only to short-term solutions of decreasing budget deficits while industry seeks improved profits by major emphasis upon marketing, creative accounting and management reorganization while paying only lip service to strengthening their long-term industrial bases. Instead of relying upon exportation of high technology, we are depending increasingly upon exportation of raw materials and agriculture and military products. We are allowing our industrial primacy to disintegrate as evidenced by the virtual disappearance of our steel industry, the decline of imagination of our transportation industry and the continuing decline of our communications and electronics industries. As a result we are losing control of the leadership in investments and banking and the control of our economic and political futures. This decay is becoming a world-wide perception that, unfortunately, is based upon a realistic appraisal.
>
> What more disturbing evidence of this decline exists than the precipitous decrease in our support for foreign nationals to participate in our institutions of higher education. No more obvious impact of our society's advances and advantages exists than the experiences provided to visiting Chinese scholars in our country. At the University of Minnesota we have been privileged to experience the pleasure of communicating and sharing first hand our scientific knowledge with a large number of highly motivated and dedicated Chinese scholars. We have welcomed them into our laboratories, classrooms and homes. Yet support for these exchange programs is declining just at the time when we have begun to break through political and social barriers. Furthermore, support for mutual participation of Americans in the development of institutions within other nations is being drastically curtailed.
>
> At the same time lip service is being paid to encouraging basic research while the bases for supporting the work being conducted in our universities are being precipitously eroded as attested to by the decline in the funding for the programs of the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. Furthermore, research increasingly is being product targeted. Support of scholarship per se at all levels of education is disappearing rapidly.
>
> Public school systems are experiencing decreasing support leading to narrowing breadth and depth of curricular offerings and larger class sizes. The influences of these changes will be detrimental to our students' college preparedness and will impair the quality of education opportunities.
>
> The decline of support of the humanities, which historically has been the underpinning of any great society, is being sacrificed. We are seeing major retrenchments of the entire public education system. Even the State of Minnesota, which has prized itself as the pinnacle of educational accomplishments, is seeing its public school and university systems destroyed in order to fulfill short-term expediencies. Does anyone really believe that, once diminished, these systems and their valuable products can be rapidly restored?
>
> Education is the most potent weapon we have for assuring the survival of our society as we know it. To retreat passively into a

posture of narrowing horizons will destroy the fabric of our social and economic structure. Education has been the driving force behind individual and community strivings and accomplishments.

We can ill afford continuation of the present decline of support of our entire educational system. Now more than ever local communities, state legislatures and the federal government should fulfill their responsibilities to support the magnificent educational enterprises which have been the envy of the world.●

ESTIMATED TAX AND SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. DON RITTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, many senior citizens have been penalized for not declaring and paying estimated tax for income not subject to withholding. Those older Americans on fixed incomes, where every penny counts, are particularly affected. I have introduced, H.R. 5328, a bill that will provide some relief for these senior citizens.

Many retired people do not realize they are required to make estimated payments. The pay as you go feature of the Federal income tax system that requires employers to withhold income tax on income such as salaries, wages, and tips also applies to a retiree's income not subject to withholding or income where not enough tax is withheld. A retiree is required to file a declaration of estimated tax and pay the income and self-employment tax estimated to be due for income coming from, for example, self-employment, alimony, pensions, annuities, interest, dividends, rents, and capital gains.

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1982 provides that a declaration of estimated tax is not required in 1982 if the estimated tax is under $200 and the estimated gross income not subject to withholding includes less than $500 of taxable income. My bill would provide for those 65 and older that a declaration of estimated tax shall not be required and no penalty shall be imposed where the amount involved is under $500.

This change will relieve many senior citizens of the burdensome penalties for not declaring and paying estimated tax. And, in these times of inflation, this bill will further protect the senior citizen from loss of income.●

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM A MUST

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as we return to our duties from the holiday recess, our thoughts turn to the year ahead and the challenges which face this body in 1982. Topping the list of challenges for this Congress undoubtedly is reform of the social security system.

As the following editorials from the Omaha World-Herald point out, however, that reform cannot be accomplished with mirrors. To do so would indeed violate the people's trust in a system upon which so many rely.

Even if Congress succeeds in acting to place the system on a sound financial footing, its efforts will be in vain unless the mechanism for recording benefits and delivering payments works swiftly, effectively, and efficiently. A second editorial, also from the World-Herald, wisely reminds us of that equally important problem

I commend the following two articles to my colleagues. When debate commences on social security reform legislation, I hope that the thoughts expressed in these two articles will be remembered:

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Dec. 29, 1981]

Faith Broken on Trusts

Normally when trust funds are set up, mingling of the funds is not authorized. Neither is borrowing from one fund for another. Violation of a trust makes the violator liable for any loss coming to the trusts' beneficiaries.

The Senate has passed legislation permitting borrowing among the three Social Security trust funds until January 1983.

With this legislation Congress probably can clear its legal skirts, but isn't borrowing among government trust funds just as questionable and unsound a practice as if it were done among private trust funds?

The original Social Security Act of 1935 set up the Old Age Survivors' Insurance Fund. Later came the Hospital Insurance and the Disability Insurance trust funds. Obviously, Congress intended each fund to be separate as it was set up.

Economist Paul Samuelson once referred to the Social Security system as it has evolved as a Ponzi game. The Barron's publication has called it a "chain-letter scheme."

The legislation Congress is about to approve is again patchwork. And it only adds to the impression that Social Security has indeed been handled like a Ponzi game or a chain-letter scheme.

What Congress is now doing is a breach of faith with those who set up the three funds years ago—and more importantly, with American citizens whose money goes into the funds.

[From the Omaha World-Herald Jan. 4, 1982]

S.S. Clogs Old Computers

The computer is a wondrous device, but it does have limitations, and it can't be force-fed.

And therein is a national problem—almost a scandal.

Some Social Security computers are so old that maintenance parts are no longer made for them. Pay is so low for computer operators that there are currently 700 vacancies in the Social Security Administration, in a time of high unemployment.

That's one reason it takes an average of nine weeks to get a new Social Security card. The Social Security office is three years behind in recording some earnings necessary for calculating benefits.

Fortunately, improvements are coming.

John A. Svahn, the commissioner of Social Security, is completing a five-year plan for modernizing the computer system. He said it will cost $400 million to $500 million over the next five years to get out the kinks.

One change is being made which, by February, should cut to two weeks the average waiting time to get a new Social Security card.

"I don't think there is going to be much of a problem of getting money (for improvements)," Svahn said. "The systems problems are acute."

It took four months of around-the-clock computer operations to process the July cost-of-living increase.

The government came within 18 hours of missing its mailing deadline. The Social Security office needs 5,000 hours of computer processing each month. The capacity is only 2,300 hours.

Because of that overloading, a lot of important work gets put off.

The agency estimates that more than $60 million in benefits were paid to relatives of dead beneficiaries and up to $10 million was improperly paid in black lung benefits because the computers did not have the capability of matching death records with beneficiaries.

Social Security hasn't yet recorded the earnings of one million workers for 1978 and for even greater numbers for 1979 and 1980, although this information is vital for figuring benefits due.

"There are people out there who have earned an increased benefit and they haven't gotten it yet," Svahn said.

The public, the White House and Congress should support Svahn in completing the modernization program as quickly as possible. To let the problem go this long is no tribute to past administrations.●

COMMEMORATION OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES L. NELLIGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. NELLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are marking this month the 64th anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day—freedom from Russian Dominance was established on Janurary 22. 1918.

This short-lived independence occurred after the tsarist government was overthrown in the U.S.S.R. and a Provisional Government was established.

Although formally acknowledging the right of secession, the Russian Provisional Government and later the Bolsheviks remained unrelentingly firm in their commitment to bring the Ukraine under a centralized Russian control. In direct response to the ruthless Soviet determination, the Ukrainian Parliament, or Rada, formally declared the Ukraine to be an independent republic on January 22, 1918. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian hope was swallowed up in the devastation of the war, and in the cultural, political, and economic suppression which the Soviets imposed. The Ukrainians have been the victims of this ruthless suppression ever since.

I join with Ukrainians of the 11th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I am privileged to represent, in saluting the valor with which the Ukrainian people declared their independence in 1918. Let us pray that those who remain the victims of Soviet suppression and control are freed of this yoke in the near future.●

NATIONAL YEAR OF DISABLED PERSONS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that my legislation designating 1982 as the National Year of Disabled Persons has received the support of 215 Members of the House. It is my hope that House Joint Resolution 354 will receive the additional support of more Members of this body in order that it might be considered by the entire House. The Senate passed an identical version of this legislation by voice vote in December, and I believe it is only fitting that the House should follow suit.

As we all know, 1981 was declared the International Year of Disabled Persons. The themes of partnership and community-based grass-roots efforts dominated this very special year. Disabled and nondisabled citizens worked together toward the goal of improving the lives of 35 million Americans with disabilities. More than 1,850 communities, from small towns to major cities; 250 leading corporations; and 330 national organizations have participated in this broad-based, national effort.

While that IYDP ended officially on December 31, interest and commitment remain high. Approval of my resolution would assure the continuity of a movement which owes its strength to self-help, private sector initiatives, particularly important in a time of increasing budgetary restraints when people are being called upon to do more for themselves. Successful passage of my resolution would also serve as a powerful symbol for those who have worked long and hard on behalf of disabled Americans and who want to continue what they have begun.●

HOUSE EXPORT TASK FORCE—U.S. AUTO INDUSTRY

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the Trade Subcommittee of Senate Finance held a hearing in early December 1981, to review developments in the U.S. automobile industry in the context of the Japanese announcement to voluntarily restrain exports in May 1981. The Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, Lionel H. Olmer, testified before the subcommittee in one of the most powerful statements made on that issue to date.

As my distinguished colleagues know, we have a severe trade imbalance with Japan. The reason, as Mr. Olmer states, "is a profound inequality in our access to the Japanese economy." As chairman of the House export task force, I am greatly concerned with the effects the Japanese policies are having on American export trade, and our economy.

We must urge more forcefully the Japanese Government to be more responsive to our repeated calls to open their doors to American imports. Reciprocity is not the answer. Rather, it is the promotion and encouragement of free trade.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the testimony of Under Secretary Olmer before the Senate Trade Subcommittee hearing on the U.S. automobile industry. I commend it to your attention and that of my distinguished colleagues.

TESTIMONY OF UNDER SECRETARY LIONEL H. OLMER

Originally, I had prepared a short oral statement which covered essentially the same ground as the statements offered today by Ambassador Macdonald, Mr. Dederick and Mr. Hormats. Let me, Mr. Chairman, spare you and the Committee this redundancy and tell you what is foremost on my mind as we discuss the auto issue.

The trade situation in autos and auto parts between Japan and the United States is symptomatic of the larger problem in our trade relationship with Japan—that is, the enormous U.S. trade imbalance with Japan, which this year will exceed $15 billion, and unless present trends are changed could reach as high as $50 billion by 1990. In autos and auto parts alone the U.S. trade deficit with Japan in 1981 will exceed $10 billion.

Before identifying the root cause of the Japanese surplus, some explanations must be eliminated.

These staggering trade deficits with Japan are not in general the result of lack of competitiveness of U.S. products. Even highly competitive U.S. industries are denied access to the Japanese market.

It is not caused by the strong U.S. dollar or high U.S. interest rates. The growth of the U.S. deficit predates the strong dollar, and Japan is simultaneously running a proportionally larger surplus with the EC, where currencies have been weak.

It is not caused by U.S. apathy in developing the Japanese market. The United States has a substantial 34 percent of the Japanese market for manufactured imports. The problem is that Japan does not import much in the way of manufactures. We have a large share of a small pie.

No. These are not the reasons. The fundamental reason for Japan's surplus is a profound inequality in our access to the Japanese economy. This inequality is caused by long-standing Japanese policies and practices which encourage exports and discriminate against imports. It is caused by a pervasive bias against imports at virtually every level of private and government decision-making. It can only be solved by timely, effective and fundamental change in these policies by the Japanese Government.

This is the basic message Secretary Baldrige and I conveyed to Prime Minister Suzuki and other Japanese leaders on our recent trip to Japan. We made four key points:

The imbalance is becoming a political issue which threatens to affect our total relationship.

We do not seek to redress the imbalance through restrictions on Japanese imports, but rather through an expansion of U.S. exports to Japan.

The Administration and the Congress are equally concerned and united in their insistence on effective Japanese measures. The letter we delivered to Prime Minister Suzuki from 31 members of the House Export Task Force was an effective expression of the depth of Congressional concern. I would like to introduce this letter for the record.

Finally and most importantly, the time for talk is over. The time for action on the part of the Japanese is now.

We are running out of time to postpone the hard choices. We cannot accept emergency or limited piecemeal concessions. We need:

A measurable and sustained increase in Japanese inports of U.S. manufactured goods including autos and auto parts. Although Japan is the second largest economy in the free world, its imports of manufactures are about equivalent to those of Switzerland. Japan's imports of manufactures on a per-capita basis are the lowest in the industrial world.

A dismantling of the web of blatantly protective devices around Japan's agriculture.

A reduction in some of Japan's remaining high duties on manufactured goods.

Elimination of the permissive treatment of business cartels in Japan and the informal industry clubs which restrict imports and sustain uncompetitive Japanese industries. These devices keep out competitive U.S. exports, even though the U.S. export prices are substantially lower than domestic prices in Japan.

Opening up Japanese high technology development programs to genuine market competition, including the participation of foreign firms.

The U.S.-Japan economic relationship—the single most important economic relationship in the free world—is clearly in serious trouble. The problem has been developing for well over a decade. With a $20 billion deficit looming for next year, we are running out of time for discussion.

Our economic relationship has not been conducted on a fully reciprocal basis. It should be. Our trading relationship must afford us substantially equivalent competitive opportunity.

The time for a genuine and effective Japanese response is now.●

ROY ACUFF AND THE SOUND OF COUNTRY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, country music did not begin with Roy Acuff, nor did the Grand Ole Opry. We associate both, however, with this remarkable man who has shaped them over the past 40 years. The popularity of these national institutions is tied to him and his role will be forever etched in our memories in association with them.

Roy Claxton Acuff was born in Maynardville on on a fall day in 1903. He was educated in the public school system of Knoxville, and is a graduate of Knoxville Central High School. I have no doubt that growing up in the mountains of east Tennessee left its mark on him, and has been the wellspring of his inspiration and his character.

Country music is, after all, about the country. It is about the traditions and trials of the common man. It is rural in setting, but universal in its appeal. Roy Acuff knows this. He has heard the "Wabash Cannonball" and taken that "Night Train to Memphis." When he saw the "Wreck on the Highway," he "didn't hear nobody pray."

Acuff has the ability to transport us to a world we all know. It is a world of loneliness where the sound of a train whistle cuts through the darkness and awakens us to our surroundings. Listening to his music, we can forget our troubles, for a time, and are lifted by his voice and fiddle to one of those mountain peaks, where for a moment everything is clear.

Roy Acuff came to the Grand Ole Opry in 1938 with his band, the Smoky Mountain Boys. He has traveled with the Opry in its tours around the world, and from the historic Ryman Auditorium to the impressive Opryland Complex. There, a theater bears his name.

I have heard him many times, in person, on record, radio, and television. I am sure many of my colleagues have also been impressed and touched by his music in the national broadcasts of the Opry.

He is, however, more than an artist and musical craftsman. As a founder of Acuff-Rose, he has shown business skills and given an opportunity to struggling writers and musicians. Falling back on his first Tennessee roots, he was the Republican candidate for Governor in 1948; entertaining while he campaigned.

There is a good deal more one can say about Roy Acuff. I could describe the way he balances the fiddle bow on his nose, or his friendship with Presidents. The best way for you to appreciate this man as I do, however, is to encourage you to listen to him. My favorite song is "Great Speckled Bird." You might try that out for starters, and then enjoy the many gifts Roy Acuff has given us. There you will discover the sound of country.●

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

SPEECH OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 26, 1982

● Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today to commemorate the 64th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence.

Established on January 22, 1918, following the collapse of the Tsarist Russian empire, the Ukrainian National Republic fell under Soviet domination in 1920. Since that time the Ukrainian people have endured the systematic denial of human liberties by the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the Ukrainian people have perservered in their efforts to secure their freedom.

The citizens of the Ukraine are not alone in their struggle. In the United States there are over 1,200 local Ukrainian-American groups which remind those Europeans who have made their homes here not only of their cultural heritage, but also of the severe legal and political restrictions imposed on the citizens of the Ukraine.

As a Representative who has long supported resolutions condemning human rights violations, I salute the Ukrainian-American community for its efforts on the behalf of the Ukraine.●

IN PRAISE OF THE LATE SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT OF OHIO

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my long-time friend Tom Roeser has composed a timely and highly significant essay on the late Senator from Ohio, the illustrious Robert A. Taft.

Tom Roeser is president of the City Club of Chicago, a fellow of Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, and an executive with Quaker Oats Co. In addition, he is a public-spirited and community-minded individual, a student of American political history, and an articulate spokesman on subjects related to public and political affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to attach hereto Tom Roeser's article "Robert A. Taft: This Political Groupie's Hero" which appeared in the Sunday, January 24, 1982, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 24, 1982]

ROBERT A. TAFT: THIS POLITICAL GROUPIE'S HERO

(By Thomas F. Roeser)

Each political groupie has his own special hero. My idol has always been a balding politician with a pot belly, rimless spectacles, flat voice and bristling demeanor who made his last presidential bid at age 63.

Thirty years ago this month he was huddling with fellow non-charismatic, overweight pols when there was a rap at the door of his hotel suite. He opened it and was blinded by TV floodlights. Seventy cheering college-preppie Republicans surprised him by bringing to his room a baby elephant and TV cameras to record the presentation.

I am proud that my man snarled, "Get that —— thing out of here!" and slammed the door on the disgusting spectacle.

He could only have been Ohio's Sen. Robert Alphonso Taft.

Taft's opponent for the GOP nomination that year was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, who—although a man of merit—glided to party victory on the wings of TV propaganda-fakery, spurious pleas for "reform" (against a bogus Texas delegate "steal") and an incandescent grin. Taft, stuck with only his own intellectual cogency and fearless integrity, could not withstand the jingo jingles and "I Like Ike" songs that came from the well-heeled Eastern Seaboard. Fifteen months after the debilitating 1952 convention, Taft was dead.

His doctor said the cancer that killed him stemmed from the physiological change prompted by severe disappointment. Maybe; maybe not. But it has always intrigued me that our current crop of glib, blow-dried TV analysts doesn't know history well enough to tell Americans what they could have had in the presidency if their predecessors, the erstwhile liberals, had allowed Taft to be nominated and elected . . . and had God permitted him to serve.

Taft's value was that on most issues he was at least three decades ahead of his time. He always opposed U.S. entry into wars, favoring instead assisting others to fight for freedom; in 1940 he forced repeal of the arms ban in order to aid beleaguered Britain and France. He favored NATO, but voted against it because of its military pact. The United States, he said, should never state where and when it was prepared to fight. He supported the Marshall Plan but felt it was coddling Western Europe—putting it in an incubator that would rob it of initiative to withstand totalitarian bluster.

In domestic policy he was amazing, although again liberals and the media were looking the other way at prettier political faces. An unrelenting critic of federal waste, he nevertheless called for an income flour for the poor (which we now call income maintenance). He rectified pro-labor imbalance by enacting Taft-Hartley, the first revision of a federal program in U.S. history ever to pass without the draftsmanship-aid of a single federal department. He did it himself.

Was he a labor-baiter? Far from it. He single-handedly beat down President Harry Truman's request for authority to draft strikers who interfered with the Truman concept of the public interest. "A domestic government," said Taft, "cannot prohibit strikes and remain free."

The House passed Truman's draft authority in two hours, since hatred of unions, due to a series of paralytic strikes, was corrosive. But fortunately for labor, Taft crushed the unconstitutional draft-the-strikers bill in the Senate. He received no thanks from labor, just unremitting hatred, for his efforts. On the economy, he railroaded through a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut, repassed it over Truman's veto and won the judgment of history that the postwar recession was eased by the measure, with no roaring inflation and no looming deficits—despite what the Keynesians had predicted.

Occassionally wrong, he was never in doubt. While his naive hopes for federalized education and housing were misplaced, had he become president his policy of restraint in foreign affairs and innovation in domestic matters just might—under his sober guidance—have avoided the mismanagement that occurred under Democratic liberals.

But we can ony guess; 1950s big-picture, hawkish liberalism promoted by Time-Life publications and a mindlessly compliant TV brought him down. conservatism passed from him to the hawks—Dulles, Knowland, Goldwater and, ultimately, Nixon, a rudderless pragmatist with no visible principles.

Now Ronald Reagan, of Taftian tradition but not philosophy, must necessarily be penurious domestically and expansive militarily. An intriguing question: Would a relatively non-interventionist foreign policy in the 1950s have gained Soviet confidence and avoided the bruising confrontations of the '60s and '70s, and the whopping defense budgets today?

But a better question remains: Can we produce future presidents of Taftian integrity and prescience who can win the confidence of TV liberals—all but indispensable to communicate with voters? Whenever I think of the graceless, brilliantly intellectual, totally misunderstood Taft and what might have been, I pray God we can. ●

PROFESSIONALISM AT ITS BEST: HAROLD AND LILLIAN AUGUSTINE

HON. BERNARD J. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I commend to my colleagues the achievements of two outstanding citizens of my district, Harold and Lillian Augustine.

He is a workaholic who likes to help people. She stresses self-worth and pride in the classroom and the importance of involving parents in the process. They both represent a quietly effective father-daughter team who have made life a lot better for the citizens of Perth Amboy, N.J.

The State of New Jersey recently recognized the profound contributions of the two in two significant tributes.

Ms. Augustine, a 15-year veteran of the city's school system, has been named New Jersey's "Teacher of the Year," selected from a field of 21 candidates—one from each of the State's 21 counties.

Chosen on the basis of her dedication, professionalism, creativity, loyalty, and excellence, Lillian Augustine has done extensive work with parents, bilingual kindergarten programs, and curriculum improvements.

That dedication and initiative has inspired a lot of young minds during her 15 years teaching second grade, first grade, and now kindergarten in the community where she herself grew up.

Both Ms. Augustine and her father, Perth Amboy City Clerk Harold Augustine, newly elected president of the New Jersey Municipal Clerks Association, exemplify the kind of grassroots hometown commitment upon which this country thrives.

Perth Amboy's city clerk for more than 20 years, Harold Augustine is considered the embodiment of what a city clerk should be.

Together and apart, Harold and Lillian Augustine have made a difference, reflecting an intense pride in their community and their work; theirs is a powerful example to all of us dedicated to the betterment of society. ●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES F. MORGAN

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a very fine man—a constituent of mine, Charles F. Morgan, who recently retired as mayor of Shadyside, Ohio.

Mr. Morgan has dedicated 16 years to public service in various capacities. For 16 years he served as Democrat precinct committeeman. For 14 years he served on the Belmont County Democrat Executive Board. He served as a member of the Shadyside Village Council for 6 years. After the results of the 1970 national census, it was learned that Shadyside's population had increased and qualified it to become a city. Whereupon, in 1972, Charles Morgan was elected as the city's first mayor and served in that position until December 1981.

Although Charles Morgan, known as Shorty, has held numerous public offices, he has also devoted much of his time to civic organizations, many of which have honored him. He is a past President of the Lion's Club; an outstanding member of the Shadyside Boosters Club; and is on the board of directors for the Citizens National Bank.

He has been instrumental in a number of projects which benefitted Shadyside, including the construction of State Route 7 through the city, construction of the secondary water treatment plant, and the rehabilitation of sewer lines throughout the community.

Shorty Morgan has given much to the citizens of Shadyside and we are all very grateful. We wish him continued success in his future endeavors and we thank him for his significant contributions. ●

THE HEROIC RESCUE OF JIM BRADY

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, in our absorbtion with the big issues in our Nation, we really ought to take time out to learn about those unsung heroes and heroines who do not make the headlines but do make their substantial contributions to humanity.

Ray Coffey, the Washington bureau chief for the Chicago Tribune, wrote an article that appeared on December 30, 1981, that ought to warm all our hearts and I share it, with pleasure, with my colleagues:

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 30, 1981]

THE HEROIC RESCUE OF JIM BRADY

(By Raymond Coffey)

WASHINGTON.—Time magazine has chosen Lech Walesa, Poland's celebrated—and now arrested but still apparently defiant—freedom fighter as its "Man of the Year," and who could argue with that?

We all need heroes. They inspire us, raise our hopes, reinforce our finest values, make us realize that things are never as bad as they seem, that it's all worthwhile, that tomorrow can be better.

And certainly Walesa is a hero on a heroic scale.

But we also have here in Washington a hero who operates on a more modest scale and who has gone largely unheralded. And he gets my vote for unsung Man of the Year.

He is Dr. Arthur Kobrine, the 38 year old Chicago-born neurosurgeon who saved and restored Jim Brady's life after the White House press secretary was shot in the brain during last spring's assassination attempt on President Reagan.

Doctors generally don't get many rave reviews these days. They don't make house calls, they charge too much, they're more interested in tax shelters than in healing the sick. All they do is tell to "take two aspirin and call me in the morning." So the litany goes.

None of that even remotely applies to Dr. Kobrine. Just ask Jim Brady, and his wife Sarah.

For nine long months now, ever since the assasin's bullet blew away part of Brady's brain and the TV networks prematurely pronounced him dead, Kobrine has skillfully, patiently, compassionately devoted himself to the rescue of Jim Brady.

And he has pulled off what seems to me, as a friend of the Bradys, and to many medical experts—and certainly to the Bradys—a near-miracle.

Even Kobrine has admitted that he was at first pessimistic about the chances for keeping Brady alive. And after the first crisis, the first brain surgery, was over, there developed new complications requiring three additional operations.

Each time it worked, and each time Brady came out of the crisis a little better.

Finally, just before Thanksgiving Brady, though still suffering some paralysis on his left side, was able to deck himself out in kelly green sweater and green tartan trousers and walk out of George Washington University Hospital.

Through it all, Kobrine remained quietly, modestly in the background giving most of the credit for the near-miracle to the courage and spirit and unquenchable humor of his patient.

"Overwhelming luck," also got much of the credit from Kobrine, who graduated from Northwestern University Medical School in 1968.

Kobrine always kept his feet on the ground. One day last summer, when I accompanied George Halas, the legendary 86-

year-old owner of the Chicago Bears football team, on a visit to Brady we bumped into Kobrine in the hospital corridor.

By this time a lot of us were thinking of Kobrine as pretty much a legend himself.

But Kobrine, in his green surgical suit, came up, stopped Halas, shook his hand and like a kid with his own heroes, said, "Coach Halas, I recognize you. I'm from Chicago. What are you doing here?"

Every year at this time the newspapers and magazines and TV screens are filled with reviews, in words and pictures, of the year that was: the tragedies and triumphs, the villains and heroes, the dashed hopes and lifted spirits of the year ending.

Going into the new year, we like to forget the tragedies and villains and dashed hopes and remember only the good parts.

Arthur Kobrine and Jim and Sarah Brady and the way they triumphed over calamity are one of the good parts. Skill and spirit and valor and devotion still count, still work.

Happy New Year, to them and all of us.●

REAFFIRMING SUPPORT FOR VETERANS' HEALTH CARE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that will reaffirm our policy of providing full medical and health care for the 3.3 million older veterans now eligible to receive treatment in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The policy of providing free treatment to veterans over the age of 65 has been in existence since World War II—a policy which has as its basis the belief that this Nation has a fundamental obligation to provide for its servicemen who have given their time, their efforts, and themselves in service to our Nation. Today, there are 18,186 veterans over the age of 65, all of which are receiving these medical benefits in VA hospitals. Of the 69,294 veterans receiving treatment today in these hospitals, 35 percent have service-connected disabilities.

Continuance of this policy is critical because of the rapidly changing demographics of our veteran population. The current 3.3-million veteran pool will jump to 11 million in 4 years when World War II and Korean War servicemen reach retirement age. In anticipation of this rapid expansion of eligible veterans, the administration is contemplating reducing or eliminating benefits to veterans over 65. Such a proposal would hit at the very same population that has the greatest need of these benefits.

Reducing or eliminating benefits to veterans over 65 also places an exorbitant burden upon those veterans who rely on fixed incomes and depend upon the VA hospitals for essential health care. Current VA policy for veterans over 65 does not restrict their eligibility because of age, inability to pay, receipt of a VA pension, medicaid eligibility, or by nature of their disability. Any proposal to change this policy, combined with the proposed "federalization" of the medicaid program, could make needy servicemen over 65 the victims of their own condition.

There are currently 5,826,000 veterans of the Korean conflict and an even greater number of World War II—12,422,000. To abrogate our responsibilities to these noble individuals, who fully deserve continued health and medical care, would be a cruel hoax of a promise made to them upon their enlistment in the military. The proud tradition of service in our Armed Forces has always been coupled with the promise of this Nation to protect the health and well-being of our servicemen, particularly those who are needy and disabled. Age must be maintained a special consideration of the receipt of medical treatment by our veterans. Americanism begins with patriotism—let us maintain this tradition by reaffirming our support for these veterans. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution. The text of this resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 252

Reaffirming the support of Congress for the continued provision of full medical service for veterans over age 65.

Whereas the Nation's military veterans have provided honorable service to their country in both times of war and times of peace;

Whereas the United States, in recognition of this service, has committed itself to providing full medical services to all veterans who have reached the age of 65;

Whereas the number of veterans over age 65 will climb from the current 3,300,000 to 11,000,000 by 1986 when the great bulk of veterans of the World War II and Korean War periods will have reached age 65;

Whereas 20 percent of the 69,294 veterans currently receiving health care in Veterans' Administration hospitals are 65 years of age or older; and

Whereas advanced age should be a special consideration in the provision of health care and medical services to veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That the Congress reaffirms its commitment to a national policy of providing full medical services to veterans who have reached the age of 65.

COMMENDING JOHN W. RABER

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28 1982

● Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to commend my very good friend, a pillar of the Green Point community, Jack Raber, who is retiring as chairman of the board of the Green Point Savings Bank in my congressional district.

Jack Raber and the Green Point Savings Bank have been sensitive and responsive to the needs of the Green Point community as well as our other Brooklyn neighborhoods for many, many years.

Under Jack's leadership, the Green Point Savings Bank has compiled an enviable record of involvement in the community. As my colleagues can well appreciate, a community leader like Jack Raber will be sorely missed in the neighborhoods he served so diligently.

Along with thousands of my constituents who have seen and marveled at Jack's ceaseless efforts to improve our neighborhoods, I salute Jack Raber as he closes out his distinguished career of community service.●

A SPECIAL ANNIVERSARY

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that there is no more lovely, friendly, and charming relationship, communion, or company than a good marriage. I would like to take this opportunity to honor two people who share a marriage that is not merely good but rather, rare and beautiful. Joe Chiantelli and Valentina Filippi Chiantelli have lived, laughed, and loved together as man and wife for 60 years. For me, they are friends and family. For all of us, they are truly a remarkable and special couple.

Joe Chiantelli was born in Bozzano, Italy, to Adele and Natale Chiantelli on January 16, 1898. He grew up surrounded by two sisters and three brothers. When he was 15, he traveled to America and began working on the Southern Pacific Railroad. Valentina Chiantelli was born to Felomena and Eugenio Fillipi, also of Bozzano. Her five sisters and two brothers all remained in Italy. At the age of 23, Joe returned to Italy where he met Valentina. Father Stefano Banducci married this lovely and loving couple at the church of St. Caterina. While still in Italy, they celebrated the birth of their son, Oscar Chiantelli. Shortly thereafter, Joe returned to the United States and his wife and son followed 5 years later, when they all settled in Nevada while he continued to work for the Southern Pacific Railroad.

The Great Depression struck and even though Joe was 1 of the 15 million people in this country to lose his job, the Chiantelli family grew closer. Joe persevered and went to work for the city of Monterey, Calif., in 1934. Valentina worked to help support the family, first in the canneries and then at the Presidio, followed by Fort Ord. Their daughter, Anna, was born in Monterey. Anna is married to my brother Joe, and they have three children, Joanna, Joe, and John.

These special people are celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary with a reception at the El Rancho Room of the Naval Postgraduate School on January 30. I cannot imagine a happier occasion or a more deserving couple.

Mr. Speaker, their example of love, devotion, and dedication to each other is an inspiration for all of us. We all join in expressing our congratulations to them. Joe and Valentina, we salute you.●

MORE PRISONS MAY NOT BE THE ANSWER

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, William H. Rentschler, a prominent businessman and member of the executive committee of the John Howard Association of Chicago, authored a most perceptive and constructive article which appeared in the December 28, 1981, issue of the New York Times.

I am attaching this challenging and thought-provoking article for consideration by my colleagues and in the further hope that representatives of the administration will give Bill Rentschler's ideas their thoughtful attention.

TURN THE PRISON BUREAU INTO A "THINK-TANK"

(By William H. Rentschler)

LAKE FOREST, ILL.—President Reagan should act forthwith to dismantle the sprawling, costly, largely ineffectual Federal Bureau of Prisons and turn over most of its 42 prisons to state penal systems, whose facilities are bulging. Seventy-five percent of the bureau's inmates have no history of violence.

The drastically scaled-down bureau should be reconstituted as a penal and criminal-justice "think-tank" charged with searching out new, more productive answers out new, more productive answers to urgent questions of crime and punishment—an area of shameful failure in this century.

Such an initiative would, at the outset, yield an annual budget cut of at least $250 million, leaving perhaps $100 million a year to care for inmates remaining in bureau custody and to fund research. Despite heavy pressure from a cadre of governors, the President apparently has reconsidered the Administration' proposal to pump $2 billion into building state prisons. If he drops the proposal, and scaled down the bureau, overall savings might total as much as $5 billion in a decade, and ultimately even more.

On its face, my proposal will seem radical. It is not. It is rooted in a realistic concern for the "bottom line"—an approach that undergirds most Reagan proposals. Such a program, properly administrered, would not let loose on the public a single violent criminal. It is aimed precisely at not only slicing the budget but also reducing crime.

Consider that while overcrowding seems the eternal hobgoblin of state-prison administrators, Federal prisons are "undercrowded." They have operated mostly below their capacities during the last two years while the inmate populations of state prisons have soared 300,000 beyond those prison's capacities.

Even more important, Federal prisons' "basic" population has declined steadily from a high of 30,400 in August 1977 to 22,560 at the end of September—a reduction of 7,840 inmates, or 25.8 percent, over four years. Not included in the "basic" figure for the Federal prison population are at least 2,000 Cuban and Haitian refugees, many held without clear cause or criminal conviction, who remain captive largely because of Justice Department foot-dragging. Further, the Federal prison population is only a sliver—less than 5 percent—of the more than 800,000 people in prisons and jails across the country.

The bureau is badly run. With its bloated bureaucracy, it is neither efficient nor economical: The ratio of inmates to staff is about 2.5 to 1. In fiscal 1977, it managed some 30,000 inmates on a budget of $265 million, but it "needed" $351 million to hold 6,185 fewer prisoners in fiscal 1981 and sought $383 million for fiscal 1982 (but got about $356 million).

The annual cost to cage, feed, and guard a Federal inmate exceeds $13,000—roughly 50 percent more than the yearly cost of room, board, and tuition at Princeton or Harvard.

A 1980 report by the Comptroller General disclosed a range of shoddy, wasteful Bureau of Prison practices that, Senator Charles H. Percy said, "would have driven a private company to certain bankruptcy."

Under my proposal, starting in 1982 most Federal inmates would be transferred to state custody or paroled, put on probation, or placed into work-release or victim-compensation programs. There are other alternatives.

The more humane and modern Federal prisons—perhaps 30 overall—would be leased or deeded to the states, with caveats on staffing, programs, and treatment of inmates. The big bad "black holes," like those in Leavenworth, Kan., Marion, Ill., and Atlanta should be closed. Several prisons with a combined capacity of 2,000 to 3,000 would be retained by the bureau to hold organized-crime figures, protective-custody cases, terrorists, spies, hijackers, drug kingpins, and other special inmates.

In place of the bureau, Congress should create a research and crime-prevention center with a mandate to aid states and cities and help them upgrade their penal facilities. The bureau would devise educational and wage-paying work programs (as proposed by Chief Justice Warren E. Burger) and foster far less costly alternatives to the standard prison regimen, which is destructive to inmates and society.

The bureau could "subcontract" its research and program development to nonprofit organizations like the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and to individuals who, as independent thinkers, reject the narrow dictates and failed dogma of the penal and political bureaucracies.

This proposal fits the Administration's philosophy of cutting spending and reducing the Government's size while increasing its efficiency.

Will President Reagan and Congress embrace a controversial proposal fully consistent with their budget initiatives at the risk of some heat from a public whose views of crime and punishment have been distorted by myth and misinformation?●

RETIRING AFTER 50 YEARS IN THE MINISTRY

HON. WENDELL BAILEY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. BAILEY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1982, John B. Rollins, 2016 Tanner Bridge Road, Jefferson City, Mo., will celebrate 50 years in the ministry. The celebration will be held at the Memorial Baptist Church in Jefferson City. Pastor Rollins was born in Stone County, Mo., and ordained a minister in 1932. During his career in the ministry he has been a full-time pastor of 17 churches and iterim pastor at 2 churches. He has served as pastor of a total of 19 churches during the past 50 years in the following counties in Missouri: Barry, Boone, Cole, Jasper, Lawrence, McDonald, Maries, Miller, Moniteau, Newton, Pettis, and Stone. On March 6, 1939, Pastor Rollins married Doris Turner and has two sons, three grandsons, and one granddaughter. Pastor Rollins is the ex-president of the Association of American Retired Persons.●

EMERGENCY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT TAX INCENTIVE ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to introduce a piece of legislation which, I hope, becomes a top priority early in this new legislative session. Congress does not have the luxury of engaging in drawn out committee hearings and debate on this issue in light of the alarming unemployment rate of our Nation's youth—reaching close to 50 percent in some of our hardest hit inner cities. As we approach the summer of 1982 we must insure our young people that the American politico-economic system has not bypassed them. My colleagues, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JEFFORDS, and I have agreed on a plan which, if enacted, would encourage the private sector as well as State and local governments to hire, on a one-time emergency basis during the summer months of 1982, many of our young people who would otherwise face bleek and empty prospects during the sweltering days between May and September. This legislation provides a bridge of hope between our current economic conditions and the eventual economic recovery that the President's plan envisions. This program does not require a Federal, State, or local governmental bureaucracy to get involved in a make-work program. It merely provides the incentive for private and public employers to act according to self-interest while accomplishing Federal policy objectives. It is a truly cost-effective means of alleviating a hopefully temporary and politically explosive social condition.

In essence the plan would build upon the current targeted jobs tax credit program but with the following alternatives:

Emergency Youth Employment Tax Incentive Act—Representative Bill Goodling

DURATION OF EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PERIOD

May 17, 1982 to September 17, 1982.

QUALIFIED YOUTH

Individual who begins work between May 17 and September 17, 1982;

Aged 16 to 21 (not attained 21 on hiring date);

Is certified by the designated local agency as being a member of an economically disadvantaged family; and

Fifteen percent of the youth hired by any one employer not required to be economically disadvantaged (flexibility to employer to hire deserving youth who might not otherwise quality).

AMOUNT OF TAX CREDIT

Eighty-five percent tax credit for wages paid to qualified youth instead of 50 percent tax credit under targeted jobs tax credit program.

TO OBTAIN TAX CREDIT

Must be able to certify that qualified youth has not displaced any other individual from employment;

Hires qualified youth between May 17 and September 17, 1982; and

Assure that qualified youth works on a substantially full-time basis.

EXCLUSION FROM INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT TAXES (EFFECTS PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS)

Personal income tax;

Federal Insurance Contributions Act; and Federal unemployment tax.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 5389

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a tax credit for youth employment during the summer of 1982, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Youth Employment Tax Incentive Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amount of credit for employment of certain new employees) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) CREDIT FOR YOUTH EMPLOYMENT DURING SUMMER OF 1982.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying this subpart to wages paid or incurred to any qualified youth for services rendered on or after May 17, 1982, and on or before September 17, 1982—

"(A) subsection (a)(1) shall be applied by substituting '85 percent' for '50 percent', and

"(B) such youth (if not otherwise a member of a targeted group) shall be treated as a member of a targeted group.

"(2) QUALIFIED YOUTH.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'qualified youth' means an individual—

"(A) who begins work for the employer on or after May 17, 1982, and on or before September 17, 1982,

"(B) who has attained age 16 but not age 21 on the hiring date (as defined in subsection (d)(13)),

"(C) who has not displaced any other individual from employment by the taxpayer,

"(D) who performs services for the taxpayer on a substantially full-time basis, and

"(E) except as provided in paragraph (3), who is certified by the designated local agency as being a member of an economically disadvantaged family (as determined under subsection (d)(11)).

"(3) 15 PERCENT OF YOUTHS HIRED NOT REQUIRED TO BE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The requirements of paragraph (2)(E) shall not apply with respect to any individual for any week if a designation under this paragraph is in effect for such individual for such week.

"(B) LIMITATION.—The aggregate number of individuals with respect to whom designations by an employer under this paragraph are in effect for any week shall not exceed 15 percent of the number of qualified youths (as defined in paragraph (2) without regard to subparagraph (E) thereof) performing services for the employer during such week.

"(C) DESIGNATION.—Any designation under this paragraph shall be made by the employer at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe.

"(4) SPECIAL RULE.—Paragraph (15) of subsection (d) shall not apply to individuals treated as members of a targeted group by reason of this subsection; except that rules similar to the rules of such paragraph shall apply to certifications described in paragraph (2)(E).

"(5) EXCLUSION FROM INCOME AND CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT TAXES.—Any wages paid or incurred to a qualified youth for services performed on or after May 17, 1982, and on or before September 17, 1982—

"(A) shall not be included in the gross income of such youth under this chapter, and

"(B) shall not be treated as wages for purposes of chapter 21 (relating to Federal Insurance Contributions Act) or chapter 23 (relating to Federal unemployment tax)."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to amounts paid or incurred on or after May 17, 1982, in taxable years ending on or after such date.

DO WE WANT OUR WOMEN IN COMBAT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was an indication that our society was being totally degraded, it is found in what is happening in our armed services today. I am hoping that the present administration will reverse this process. And this reversal should occur despite the growing inclination among some officers in the military to look the other way and promote such idiocy. The adage of: To go along—to get along, should not be practiced nor condoned by the true future combat leaders of our military. One cannot reconcile a first class officer efficiency report (OER) with the scatterd remains of our future mothers of America scatterd across the battlefield.

Some food for thought on this matter was contained in a series of three articles by John Fialka in the Washington Star of January 9, 10, and 11 of 1980.

In introducing the first half of this series today, we find the realistic results of attempting to integrate women into combat units in the military. The world of realism is demonstrated when Israel utilized women in their armed services of their nation. It is high time that this Nation follows the same lead of reality that Israel did. And well to remember in this part I, are the comments of Gen. Elizabeth Hoisington, former director of the Womens Army Corps (WAC) on what can—and will happen if this trend is not reversed.

Part I of Mr. Fialka's extensively researched piece follows:

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 9, 1980]

United States Widening Women's Role As Warriors—Part I

(By John Fialka)

If the United States suddenly went to war it would field a military force that is unique. The nation now has more women in combat-related roles than any major power has ever had in a standing army.

The rapidly growing involvement of women in the U.S. military—a development fueled by chronic recruiting shortfalls of the all-volunteer force—has been accompanied by an unprecedented narrowing of the definitions and policies that have traditionally barred women from direct involvement in combat.

This narrowing, being spurred on by Defense Department policymakers intent on creating "gender-free" tests for all military categories, is causing a revolution in the Army as it prepares women for the rigors of activity on or near the front lines. Some recent examples:

New recruits being prepared for rifle-carrying, front-line support units, such as military police, air defenses, maintenance and signal companies, are training in integrated, "unisex" companies where women are given combat training alongside the men.

Army researchers are planning a series of tests to see how well units consisting of at least 50 percent women can fight during sustained periods of simulated combat.

An entire new generation of field equipment, including "unisex" combat boots, helmets, flak vests and flame-proof combat vehicle suits, is being rushed into production to meet growing complaints of women that their current, man-tailored equipment is inadequate and that some of it is actually causing injuries as the Army sends more women into the field.

While women recruits formerly clustered in occupational specialties requiring a relatively high degree of intelligence, the Army has just lowered their required entrance examination scores and is recruiting female high school dropouts for the first time.

Traditionally women have made up about 2 percent of the military. That was the level that existed in 1972, when the all-volunteer concept got under way. There were 16,300 women in the Army then. There are 60,912 women today, comprising about 8 percent. Meanwhile the size of the Army has shrunk by about 44,000.

12 PERCENT OF FORCE

In four more years Army planners expect to have 96,400 women in the service, 12 percent of the total force.

"Current policy precludes assignment of women to units routinely engaged in close combat," William D. Clark, the Army's top manpower expert, recently explained to a House Armed Services subcommittee.

"This does not mean that women soldiers may not be required to engage or be engaged by an enemy with individual and crew-served weapons (i.e. rifles and artillery), experience physical contact with enemy personnel and experience a high risk of capture."

The thought of large numbers of American women being sent into battle is an extremely disturbing one to some old soldiers who have followed the adventures of the all-volunteer army.

"No man with gumption wants a woman to fight his battles," declares retired Gen. William C. Westmoreland, former commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam. He asserts that making the Army 12 percent female "will measurably influence the effectiveness of the fighting force."

Gen. Elizabeth Hoisington, former director of the now-disbanded Womens Army Corps, argues that women lack the physical strength and aggressiveness of men and that women would be the "weak link" that could destroy a combat unit.

"The peripheral dangers of serving in combat units—being raped by strangers or temporarily crazed comrades, being taken prisoner of war and being abused, beaten and starved, being mentally and physically incapable of performing one's assigned duties in combat and being responsible for others' being killed or wounded—these are just some of the other harmful situations women would experience in combat," she asserts.

"There is more to fear than being killed and not returning to your loved ones at home.

VIEWS CALLED OUTDATED

Some of the main architects of the Pentagon's new policies reject such views as being outdated, "stereotypical views" of women.

Secretary of the Army Clifford L. Alexander and Antonia Handler Chayes, undersecretary of the Air Force, complained that those who doubt the effectiveness of women in combat-related jobs remind them of those who doubted the effectiveness of blacks during the integration efforts of the 1960s.

In 1977, when Alexander, a former chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, was appointed secretary of the Army by the Carter administration, he promptly ordered a review of all Army military occupational specialties, many of which were considered combat-related and therefore barred to women.

Alexander says he wanted the "narrowest definition of combat that was practicable." As result, the Army made a distinction. It said that units which aim weapons by line of sight at the enemy are combat units. All other units are not.

Translated, it means that women can't fight in the infantry or some types of artillery, but can serve in a host of support roles which have combat missions in time of war. The move left only 24 of 305 military occupational specialties closed to women and reversed the previous combat policy, which had barred units containing women from operating forward of rear brigade areas.

A number of other changes also were made to ease the entry and retention of women. Pregnancy, once considered by the Army as grounds for discharge, was redefined as a "temporary medical disability." Unisex basic training was established for all units where women were eligible for admission.

CHANGING OF ATTITUDE

What Alexander focused on were ways to change the military's attitudes toward women and in making sure that female soldiers had as many career opportunities as men. "That's what I take pride in," Alexander explained.

While there has been some concern in Congress over the rising proportion of women in the Army, Alexander is convinced that the nation's attitudes on the subject are radically changing and that the next major debate will not be over what has been done, but over whether there are any military specialties that should be denied to women.

Critics have pointed out that the two nations which have had the most recent experience with women in combat, the Soviet Union and Israel, have both backed away from the concept. More than 800,000 women fought with the Red Army during World War II, functioning in many combat roles. Now there are believed to be fewer than 10,000 women in the 4.2-million-person Soviet armed services, according to the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Israel, which trained women to fight alongside male soldiers in that nation's war of independence, reversed that policy in the late 1940s after studies showed that Arab units fighting sexually integrated Israeli units inflicted higher casualties. The Arab men, it appeared, fought to the death rather than be taken prisoner by units containing women.

TORTURE FEARS CITED

Tamar Eldar Avidar, attache for women's affairs at the Israeli Embassy, says the policy change was primarily based on the nation's worry that females in combat areas would be captured and tortured by the enemy.

Since then Israeli women have been trained separately in the Chen, a Hebrew acronym for women's corps, which translates into "charm."

Although women in Chen receive some defense-related weapons training, they are trained separately and are evacuated from combat areas during military alerts.

The fact that there is no historical model for the growing percentage of women now being drawn into the U.S. armed services does not bother Air Force Undersecretary Chayes. "We are creating the model here," she recently told the House Armed Services Committee.

One of the stereotypes being entertained by some male military commanders is that the presence of women in small units may destroy their combat effectiveness by reducing male camaraderie and replacing it with sexual distractions and petty rivalries.

BARRED FROM SUBMARINES

This fear has resulted in some awkward lines being drawn. For example the Navy plans to have a female content of 10 percent by fiscal 1985, including 5,000 enlisted women at sea. While it plans to assign women, at least temporarily, to warships, the Navy draws the line when it comes to putting women on submarines.

"They would be the least amenable for a mixed crew," Vice Adm. Robert Baldwin, the Navy's chief personnel officer explained to a House Armed Services subcommittee. Jealousies that erupt in the close confines of submarines "would probable be sharpened by the presence of women," he explained.

While the Army has moved boldly ahead in assigning women to combat related tasks, the Air Force and the Navy are expressly forbidden by law from assigning women to ships or aircraft with combat missions. Both services recently asked congress to remove the prohibitions to give them more "flexibility" in assigning available manpower.

While the Defense Department has been pushing ahead with its policies to expand military roles for women, pressure on senior officers to conform to the policy is described as intense.

"Being anti-woman is a career killer. I've watched some of my classmates twist themselves into pretzels over this," asserts James H. Webb Jr., an Annapolis graduate who became a Marine officer and who wrote the best-selling novel "Fields of Fire," describing combat in Vietnam.

Despite the administrative pressures, however, there are recurring signs that the message is not getting through to all of the troops.

Some of the troops are females, and their problem is not that they can't do the work but that they don't want to.

The largest pocket of resistance to the policy, however, appears to be the Marine Corps, which continues to resist unisex training and training women to use combat weapons. The corps recently went to Capitol Hill to oppose the Navy's request to remove the legal restrictions against assigning women to combat.

The corps has been charged with "sexism" by the increasingly powerful Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services for recruiting posters which present women in "ladylike situations," in sharp contrast to male Marines seen in combat gear.

There are rumors of more serious pressures, including some from Graham Claytor, Jr., deputy secretary of Defense, who reportedly has told the Marine commandant, Gen. Robert H. Barrow, to support the Navy's move to lift combat restrictions.

Neither the Defense Department nor the Marine Corps would comment on the rumors except to say that the Marine Corps' stand on the issue has not changed. "We don't train women for combat," said the Corps' spokesman, "That's illegal."

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 10, 1980]

Pressure From Top Sped Effort To Add Front-Line Spots—Part II

(By John Fialka)

The dogma of the new "unisex Army" was established in 1977 with relative ease. It is that women can function well in a number of combat-related jobs and that the Army's primary mission—to fight and win "starting with the very first battle of the next war"—will not be impaired by recruiting unprecedented levels of women.

It hasn't been easy to prove, however.

For four years Army researchers working in the largely unexplored area of men-women relationships in combat have been struggling to come up with supporting evidence as the Army has deployed more and more women to combat support units.

The Army's need for data about women in combat began in earnest in 1976. Then it bacame clear that the shortage of recruits among men for the All Volunteer Army would mean that, short of resuming the draft, the Army of the future would have to absorb a high percentage of women, roughly six times the level in the pre-volunteer era.

Researchers were sent running in all directions. The Army's military history staff was ordered to produce a study describing the role of females in combat throughout history.

The Army historians found evidence of two all-female units. A certain King Gezo of Dahomey, West Africa, maintained three regiments of women warriors, roughly 9,000 troops in all, in 1851. They were tough, well disciplined and under orders to fight to the death.

Then there was a patriotic Czarist woman, Madame Bachkarova, who recruited women for a "Battalion of Death" in 1917. The idea was that the presence of women solders "would challenge the Russian men and inspire them to fight more vigorously."

The report said the Russian unit fought "bravely" and the Dahomey women "exacted a heavy toll" in fierce hand-to-hand combat. Unfortunately, though, the African and Russian units lost. Gezo's women were outnumbered by a force of male Egba warriors. The Battalion of Death happened to be guarding the Winter Palace when the revolutionaries attacked it in 1917.

The Army historians noted that many women fought well with the Soviet Army in World War II and with the Israelis in their war of independence. "The increasing number of female urban terrorists indicates that sex is no barrier in this field," they added.

The Army Research Institute was given a different mission. It was told to test the effectiveness of 40 different combat support companies in "field conditions" using varying percentages of women up to a maximum of 35 percent. The exercises, code named "MAX WAC," began in October 1976.

More than 50 researchers were dispatched to Army posts throughout the United States. The companies they watched included maintenance, signal, transportation and military police units, all of which support combat units.

These companies operate so close to the front in war that soldiers are required to carry rifles, operate machine guns and go out on night patrols in rear areas.

The results shocked men and women. Many of the units, the researchers discovered, had simply finessed the problem in previous exercises by leaving their women back at the garrison when the men were assigned to the field.

STRANGE RESPONSES

"Local commanders were very uptight about having women go out and camp with men," said psychologist Cecil D. Johnson, chief of the Army Research.

When the Army insisted that whole units had to be tested, there were Institute's technical standards office some strange responses. One thoughful unit commander insisted that a certain female lieutenant had to have a tent with a stove in it. When the tent was set up, "the woman refused to enter it."

Sergeants had a particularly tough time because of a "role conflict between being a male and being an NCO," the MAX WAC report says. "They . . . assign men and women to do a job, but allow the women to stand by while the men work."

Women had trouble with tasks requiring physical strength and complained bitterly about the lack of privacy and adequate sanitation facilities.

One of the most disturbing findings of MAX WAC was that many of the women had never thought of their jobs as being part of warfare.

Because MAX WAC exercises were only three-days long and were often held in good weather, the Army planned a second test in a longer exercise called "Braveshield." It was held in the Mojave desert in July 1977.●

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, 1938-80

HON. BILL NELSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● **Mr. NELSON.** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article, "The Positives and Negatives of U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia 1938-80." The author, Rear Adm. Rollo Niel Norgaard, U.S. Navy (retired), is a constituent of mine.

The piece was originally published by "Officer Review", a magazine of the Military Order of the World Wars.

[From Officer Review, November 1981]

THE POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES OF U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA 1938-80

The American people have had volumes of Disinformation and Misinformation heaped upon them by foreign and domestic propaganda mills relative to the Nation's involvement in Southeast Asia during the period 1938-1980. Confidence in our elected leaders and our military services was dangerously weakened during the Vietnam War. We must honor the brave members of our Armed Forces who answered the call to fight in that War against an aggressive enemy. The time has come to take a hard look at the positive and negative sides of USA major actions in all of Southeast Asia in recent years. What follows is an effort to set the record straight. Let these facts do just that.

The area of Southeast Asia that became of special importance to the USA following WWII included those former "colonies" and countries that had been occupied by Japan during the war. They are today: Union of Burma, Republic of Indonesia, Malaysia, Republic of the Philippines, Republic of Singapore, Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Cambodia (Kampuchea), Laos which became a colony of Vietnam on July 19, 1977, and The Kingdom of Thailand, an independent nation but included here because it was occupied by the Japanese Army during WWII. The importance of these nations was embodied in their total population of 320 million people, their abundance of natural resources, and the vital strategic waterway, the Malacca Straits bordered by Indonesia and Malaysia. Incidentally, the population of Indonesia is about 140 million (90 percent Moslems) compared to 13 million people in Australia.

Suddenly, in 1945, the War in the Pacific was over for Japan. The occupied areas were thrown on their own and generally without operating governments except for Thailand. Looking at the situation from the point of view of the international communist movement which seeks world domination, here was an opportunity for them (Soviet Union and People's Republic of China) to gain control of a large strategic area for their own purposes.

The international political events occurring in the Southeast Asian area, beginning in 1945, had not received much attention by the American public. Our interest became focused, later, on Vietnam because that is where our men were fighting and dying while engaged in combat beginning in 1965. It would seem useful, therefore, to relate chronologically the major USA actions and the significant international events occurring in the whole area for a better understanding of their effects on the USA and its Allies. It should be noted that some of these actions and events, such as the return of the French to Indochina after WWII, were very complex and can not be covered in detail here. Books have been written about several of them.

We can begin in 1945 by asking the question "What should the USA do for its own best interests in Southeast Asia when WWII ended? Should we just let the communist powers move in and take over the eight "colonies" plus Thailand?" (The term "colonies" is used loosely because of varying status)

1945—In September, after the war was over in Europe, France resumed colonial control over Indochina. But, Ho Chi Minh, the communist leader, declared on September 2, 1945, Vietnam independent of France and he announced the creation of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. This was recognized by France in March 1946, but in December fighting began between the French and the North Vietnam forces called the "Vietminh". The U.S. began supplying military aid to the French.

1946—The U.S. gave the Philippines their independence.

1949—With French approval, South Vietnam was formed under their exemperor Bo Dai with its capital in Saigon. Laos declared its independence from France. Cambodia declared its association with France until 1953, then independence.

1949—Indonesia became independent, after intervention by the United Nations and concession by the Netherlands.

February 1950—President Truman announced the U.S. is sending 35 U.S. Army advisors to South Vietnam to aid France against the "Vietminh" of North Vietnam. This marks the beginning of U.S. troops in Southeast Asia. The U.S. began supplying military aid to South Vietnam in Dec. 1950. That same year, 1950, North Korea invades South Korea.

May 1954—The French forces are defeated in battle at Dien Bien Phu in North Vietnam. This ends French control of Indochina countries.

May-July 1954—The French loss brought on the Geneva Conference on Indochina. Attending were USA, France, Great Britain, Soviet Union, People's Republic of China, and the countries of Indochina. France and North Vietnam (NVN) agreed to the partition of Vietnam on the 17th parallel of latitude, a ban on new troops or bases, and the scheduling of reunification elections. However, the Geneva Conference Treaty was not signed by the USA and South Vietnam (SVN) mainly because the reunification elections would not be possible with intimidation from NVN. Therefore, the division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel was not ratified by them. The Immediate result was a large migration of people (about 900,000 mostly catholics) from NVM to SVN.

September 1954—SEATO, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, was established at a meeting in Manila by eight nations of the West (USA, Great Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Philippines, Pakistan, and Thailand)—"to contain the expansion of communism in Southeast Asia—by forming a collective defense pact". They would be based in Bangkok, Thailand. (SEATO was terminated on July 1, 1977.)

October 23, 1955—South Vietnam held national elections, deposed the ex-emperor Bo Dai, and created a Republic with Ngo Diem as the first President.

July 1959—The first two U.S. Army advisors were killed in SVN by Communist guerillas.

1960—President Eisenhower, near the end of his term in office, pledges continued assistance to SVN. His policy, however, was a "limited risk gamble" and no U.S. involvement in a land war in Southeast Asia.

December 1961—President Kennedy declares the USA is prepared to help SVN "preserve its independence."

June 1962—A majority report of the International Control Commission consisting of India, Canada, and Poland, established by the Geneva Conference Treaty of 1954, reported that their evidence shows North Vietnam is supporting, organizing, and carrying out hostile acts in South Vietnam. NVN says they are only "volunteers."

July 1962—At a Geneva Conference, fifteen countries signed an agreement in which those with military forces in Laos would withdraw them. NVN was the only country that did not carry out its pledge to remove its 7,000 men from Laos, in fact, they increased their force to 70,000 by 1972.

December 1962—U.S. military advisors in SVN were increased to 11,300.

November 1, 1963—President Kennedy was assassinated. Vice President Johnson became President of the USA.

December 1963—U.S. military advisors in SVN were increased to 15,000.

August 2-4, 1964—The Tonkin Gulf incident—Two U.S. destroyers, U.S.S. Maddox and U.S.S. Turner Joy, were attacked in a sea action by NVN torpedo boats in the Gulf of Tonkin off the coast of NVN. No damage to U.S. ships. One or two NVN torpedo boats were reported sunk. It is not clear from reports that a second attack occurred on August 4th.

August 7, 1964—The U.S. Congress (Senate and House) passed (unanimous less 2) the "Gulf of Tonkin Resolution" (not a Declaration of War) giving the President authority to "take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." The Tonkin Gulf incident was no "Pearl Harbor". It is important to draw a comparison. Before "Pearl Harbor", the country was strongly divided on several issues—pacifist and isolation from WWII, on the economy, and other matters. But, "Pearl Harbor" was of such a magnitude that all U.S. citizens were drawn together immediately with a common purpose. This was not the case with a minor incident like that in the Gulf of Tonkin—off the enemy's shores and not on U.S. territory.

September 1964—The People's Republic of China warned the United States that it would pay dearly for any plan to cross the frontier into North Vietnam from South Vietnam.

June 1965—The U.S. military commanders were authorized by President Johnson, for the first time, to commit 23,000 U.S. advisors to combat in SVN. U.S. Marines were landed at Da Nang in SVN. There was simultaneous bombing of military targets in NVN by U.S. Air Force. The U.S. forces in SVN increased rapidly, thereafter, to a total of 549,500 by the end of 1968.

This action in 1965 marked a sharp increase in the commitment by U.S. forces. Yet there was no Declaration of War by the U.S. Congress designating an enemy of the United States. There were no provisions made available under international law for blockade on the high seas, seizure and control, or for censorship, of information on combat actions of U.S. forces, disinformation and propaganda from Hanoi and the Communist World, and misinformation from news media sources going directly into the homes of the American public by radio, television, and the press.

1964-65—The Soviet Union announced a step-up in their contributions of modern weapons to Communist members in Indonesia—to assist President Sukarno in his country and the effort to crush Malaysia with its 12 million people and across the Malacca Straits. In September, 1965, a large pro-Peking communist group tried to seize complete control of the country. The regular Indonesian Army, under General Suharto, who is still the President in 1980, smashed the coup and destroyed Communist power in Indonesia.

1966—Indonesia and Malaysia (with the help of the British forces in Malaysia) end the Sukarno policy of hostility to Malaysia. They sign a mutual treaty of reconciliation. This was a highly important achievement in support of the SEATO and U.S. interests. It was a major setback for the Communist goal in Southeast Asia. Very probably, the attitude of the Indonesian people was strengthened against President Sukarno when they saw the USA and its Allies join together in SEATO in 1954, the U.S. combat commitment to SVN in 1965, and the British actions in Malaysia in 1965 and 1966. General Maxwell D. Taylor, USA, in an interview with a national magazine of Nov. 27, 1972, expressed it this way: "I think that Indonesia's independence today and its relative freedom from an internal Communist threat is attributable, to a large degree, to what we've accomplished in South Vietnam." Perhaps the United States failed to recognize the importance of it—that is, the saving of Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and the Malacca Straits (a strategic waterway) from Communist control. The U.S. forces in SVN in Nov. 1966 were 358,000.

1966—The U.S. Senate took a vote to terminate the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. It was defeated 95 to 5.

May 1968—Preliminary peace talks open in Paris with NVN and Vietcong.

January 1969—President Nixon ordered three new actions not long after taking office, to bring an end to the War in South Vietnam, and to reduce casualties to U.S. and Allied forces there:

(1) The Peace Talks in Paris were expanded.

(2) The beginning of U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam.

(3) The bombing of NVN sanctuaries and their forces (about 100,000) in Cambodia and located on the border of SVN. The U.S. armed forces and SVN had lost many men due to NVN attacks across the border, then return to their sanctuaries. NVN would not admit they had military forces in Cambodia, therefore, they did not reveal the attacks.

May 1969—The U.S. President proposed to NVN a mutual troop withdrawal from SVN. The answer by NVN was "No".

1969—The U.S. President proclaimed "Vietnamization" of the war upon withdrawal of U.S. troops. Also, other countries in Southeast Asia, threatened by Communist aggression, would be strengthened with weapons and supplies from the United States to enable them to defend themselves with their own forces. This was known as "The Nixon Guam Doctrine". It caused great concern in Hanoi on how to cope with this new development and urgent meetings were called there. Their Politburo decided on a special offensive in the fall of 1969 against the USA and South Vietnam. There would be a renewed military ground offensive, greater efforts at the Paris Peace Talks, and a massive propaganda effort in the U.S. They realized that to win a war it was necessary to break the will of the people to continue it, either by destruction of human lives and property or by changing his objective. Their experts directed their propaganda plans through centers in Europe to selected cities in the United States where anti-war activists organized demonstrations for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam. The totalitarian Communist governments have absolute control over their information media. The United States had none authorized by Congress (no Declaration of War and no censorship) and, as a result of it, the American public was vulnerable to distortion of information fed to them daily through various propaganda sources.

April-June 1970—The ground military forces of the United States and SVN combined to invade the east border area of Cambodia to capture NVN supplies and to destroy their bases which were being used for attacks on United States and SVN forces across the border. The North Vietnamese were sending their forces down the "Ho Chi Minh" Trail along the east border of Laos into the eastern highlands of Cambodia. The USA and SVN invasion caused renewed anti-war protests in the United States on college campuses and in the streets of cities.

1971—The Tonkin Gulf Resolution was this time rescinded by the U.S. Senate.

May 1972—The U.S. President orders the mining by the U.S. Navy of NVN ports—to cut off military supplies to NVN—and to pressure NVN for progress in peace negotiations and the release of U.S. prisoners-of-war.

August 11, 1972—The last U.S. combat troops leave South Vietnam. This was a very significant action. The USA can take great pride in the knowledge that all U.S. forces of battalion size or larger had won all engagements with the enemy in Vietnam.

December 18, 1972—The U.S. President orders heavy bombing (Air Force and Navy) of NVN military targets around Hanoi and Haiphong areas because Hanoi negotiators had stalled the Paris Peace Talks. This became known as the "Christmas Bombing" about which considerable misinformation was passed by Hanoi to the American public.

December 30, 1972—Hanoi agreed to resumption of the Peace Talks. The bombing stopped.

January 27, 1973—A Peace Agreement, "peace with honor", was signed in Paris by the USA and SVN with NVN and the Vietcong. It provided for release of all POW's and for the International Control Commission to supervise the Ceasefire. The USA and NVN would respect the SVN people's right to self determination and freedom. The USA and its Allies had won the war militarily and politically with the acceptance of the Peace Agreement by North Vietnam and the Vietcong.

March 1973—590 U.S. Prisoners-of-War, including 24 civilians, were released by the Communists. Several hundreds are still Missing-in-Action.

August 1973—All U.S. military action, from bases outside SVN including Sea and Air, ceased in Southeast Asia—in accordance with a law passed by Congress.

1974—But, in this year, Congress passed a law that curbed U.S. aid to SVN. No more ammunition to supply to needs of the SVN military forces. The will of the people in the USA had been influenced by disinformation and propaganda from Communist "Agents of influence" and misinformation from other sources to the extent that their representatives in the U.S. Congress voted to withhold further support for South Vietnam that would enable it to defend itself from attacks by North Vietnam.

April 1975—South Vietnam and Saigon fall to a massive invasion by NVN's regular military forces, approximately three years after U.S. combat troops had left SVN. At this point, the United States lost the psychological war with North Vietnam.

1980—Here is the situation for the nine Southeast Asian "colonies" we started out with in 1938. Three of them, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia have fallen to the political control of North Vietnam. The two Vietnams are called the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (pop. 43 million). Laos (est. pop. 2.3 million) became a colony of Vietnam on July 19, 1977. Its H'mong tribe has suffered genocide there since 1976 by gas warfare. A tragic story Cambodia (pop. est. at 5 million or less), now called Kampuchea, has suffered a complete breakdown in government and genocide of at least a third of its population, first by revolutionaries known as the Angka Loeu (Khmer Rouge), and recently the invasion and control of the country by North Vietnam. The other six, Burma, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, with a total population of 268 million people are, today, generally aligned with the West. All of them, except Burma which is neutral, have formed ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations). Their governments are probably not completely ideal democracies but they definitely are not Marxist Communist either. It is important for all Americans to recognise the value of this collective group to the Western Nations.

The people of the six countries who survived Communist expansion goals, the people of the United States and its Allies in the Vietnam War, owe a great debt of gratitude to all of their citizens, military and civilian, who did make great sacrifices to meet the Communist threat in Southeast Asia.•

CORPORATE MERGERS THAT RUIN CITIES

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

• Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the battle for control of the Marathon Oil Co. continues to be a matter of great interest and concern, both to the Members of this body and to the public at large. Certainly in my home State of Ohio, which happens to be where Marathon is headquartered, this topic commands a great deal of attention.

Recently, discussion has revolved around the relative merits of a takeover by United States Steel instead of Mobil Oil. The United States Steel bid, coming as a conglomerate merger rather than one oil company swallowing another, seems to enjoy greater public sympathy.

During the Christmas holidays, syndicated columnist Neal R. Peirce wrote a very thoughtful column about the Marathon takeover and its likely consequences for the citizens of Findlay, Ohio. He notes that there will be little to cheer about, regardless of which suitor ultimately prevails.

Much of Mr. Peirce's column is based upon information gathered in a series of hearings held in 1980 by the House Small Business Subcommittee on Antitrust as well as the subsequent report on conglomerate mergers, issued by the House Small Business Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have served as a member of the Small Business Commitee and its Antitrust Subcommittee and to have participated in the hearings on conglomerate mergers and their effects on small business and local communities. All of us with an interest in this subject gratefully acknowledge the leadership and foresight of our colleague, Berkley Bedell, who chaired those hearings.

At this point in the Record, I insert the full text of Neal R. Peirce's column as it appeared in the Washington Post on December 27, 1981.

Corporate Mergers That Ruin Cities

(By Neal R. Peirce)

Lost in the battle of the titans to take over Marathon Oil has been the deep and some times irremediable loss any city suffers when a major home-based industry falls to outside ownership.

In Findlay, Ohio, the town of 36,000 that was born and grew with Marathon, the townspeople fear that Mobil would close down Marathon's headquarters quicker than one can say "oil well." All 2,400 jobs at Marathon would be jeopardized, since Mobil's prime interest is in acquiring Marathon's huge oil reserves.

And, says Findlay Mayor Bentley Burr: "The value of Marathon to this community lies in more than just dollars. How do you calculate the value of the leadership Marathon employes have given the town, to civic organizations, the contributions to the quality of life?"

So Marathon and Findlay have found their would-be "white knight"—U.S. Steel. "Welcome U.S. Steel," says a flashing sign outside the city hall. "At least we think this is a company that isn't going to turn Marathon's headquarters into a parking lot," a local stockbroker told the Associated Press.

Perhaps so. Certainly U.S. Steel wouldn't be in a position to fire all of Marathon's oil industry experts. It would need their skills. But what of the bookkeeping, personnel, payroll functions that any corporation can perform? The common takeover pattern is that firings start in 12 to 18 months—promises to keep the old staff intact notwithstanding. Headquarters start looking for ways to maximize the profits of subsidiaries, and duplicate staffs are an inevitable target.

Then everyone else in the city starts to suffer. Bank accounts, legal work, insurance, advertising and accounting services are transferred away. From the United Way to the arts to downtown development, essential leadership is lost. With job losses and property abandonment, everyone's taxes escalate.

The 1981 business merger boom—running at a level of unprecedented billions of dollars—is like an arrow aimed at the economic health, government solvency and civic leadership of every city in America with businesses that might be ripe for takeover.

It's not weak or poorly managed firms that corporate giants seek to swallow. Rather, they are looking for profitable, conservatively run companies with a depressed market price for their strong stock, balance sheets and market positions. The sad fact, says Marquette University professor Peter Marchetti, is that good management can easily lead to extinction in a world dominated by "conglomerates for whom capital in the abstract is everything."

Sadder still is what so often happens to acquired firms. Sometimes—as in the notorious takeover of Youngstown Steel by the Lykes conglomerate—the big corporation just uses its new property as a "cash cow," milking its profits and investing them elsewhere. Eventually, the weakened plant is shut down.

Or the conglomerate may set an arbitrary profit or market share the subsidiary must achieve. If it fails, it is simply closed down and the parent company moves on to seek better investment elsewhere. By contrast, home-city company owners accept good years with bad and may be satisfied with much more modest profits.

The unhappy fate of acquired firms—and their home towns—was dramatised last year in a national survey of corporate takeovers by the U.S. House Small Business antitrust subcommittee. "Conglomerate mergers do not create new productive resources and rarely develop new markets," the subcommittee found. "The rates of job creation, productivity and innovation slow after independent companies are absorbed."

Alfred Dougherty, then director of the Federal Trade Commission's bureau of competition, told the subcommittee: "A conglomerate—lacking community loyalty—can simply write off a line of business, a plant, a work force, or a whole community and can turn its attention elsewhere, leaving others to pick up the pieces."

Other witnesses came from cities in Massachusetts, Virginia, Ohio and Maine to tell just how that happened to them. One of the most disturbing stories was told by Hopedale, Mass., Town Administrator Bernard Stock. Draper Looms, which had employed 2,400 of the town's 4,000 residents, used to contribute 30 percent of the town's property taxes. Founded in the 19th century, it had built the town hall, high school, country club, airport, railroad, sewage plant, power facility and even donated land for the town cemetery.

But in 1967, Rockwell International acquired Draper Looms. Stock told how the executive staff was moved to Pittsburgh. "We no longer had someone in the town of Hopedale who could make a decision on company/town-related problems." Research, development and maintenance staffs were cut to the bone. The building began to deteriorate. Some $30-40 million of Draper corporate savings were transferred to the parent company. Managers were rotated through the plant. The factory was gradually closed down, its workers discharged. The town lost hundreds of thousands of dollars in property taxes.

"They made a valiant attempt to run a business they knew nothing about and took the business and us down with them," said Stock.

Small wonder, then, that critics of the merger mania suggest big companies use their cash to reinvest in their own operations, instead of acquiring viable companies and then shuttling jobs from hard-pressed cities to remote rural areas and the Third World.

Sad to say, though, all seems now to aid the merger boom. Six oil companies alone got banks to advance a staggering $25 billion in lines of credit during the recent Conoco takeover bids—a sure inflationary pressure. Big companies also persuaded federal courts to overturn several state statutes written to slow takeover bids of resisting corporations.

And the Reagan administration's new antitrust chief, William Baxter, proclaims: "There is nothing written in the sky that says the world would not be a perfectly satisfactory place if there were only 100 companies." Teddy Roosevelt must be spinning in his grave!

Perhaps the time has come for a new patriotism: one that recognizes, as the House Small Business subcommittee suggested, that "the national interest may better be served by strengthening the role of independent businesses in the economy, as they are the most productive, the most innovative and the most prolific job-generating sector."•

PRESERVING THE ENVIRONMENT: WE MUST MAINTAIN THE FEDERAL ROLE AND A STRONG EPA

HON. ANTHONY TOBY MOFFETT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

• Mr. MOFFETT. Mr. Speaker, there is a strong environmental consensus in this country which backs the efforts of EPA. This is a consensus which cuts across party lines, because Republicans and Democrats alike want to drink clean water, want to breathe clean air, and want to continue to have the opportunity to visit pristine national parks—our Nation's crown jewels.

Yet, the American environmental legacy is threatened, not only for future generations, but right now. The threat is coming from the policymakers of EPA who are charged with the responsibility of protecting the environment.

In a recent article in the Amicus Journal, I have discussed a variety of challenges which the environment and Americans are facing. The EPA budget has been characterized as a "time bomb in the basement approach" to pollution control. But there is more—much more subtle attempts to compromise our Nation's commitment to clean water and clean air.

I urge my colleagues to read the article—based in the main on investigations by my Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources—and to redouble their commitment to a clean and healthy environment. More so, I would hope that we can end the blithe and hidden strategy, which our subcommittee has discovered, to compromise EPA's effectiveness from the inside.

A Case of Duplicity—How EPA Is Reneging on its Toxic Discharge Program

(By Toby Moffett)

EPA Administrator Anne Gorsuch has stated repeatedly that EPA can do a "better job with fewer federal resources." Since this administration blithely has pledged to balance the budget while cutting taxes and hiking military spending, it is not surprising to hear such a claim, though no one seriously can believe that the EPA budget can be cut by 50 percent without jeopardary to public health and the environment.

Unfortunately, Reagan's environmental economics are no more credible than his supply-side economics. Conservatives have proclaimed for years that there is no such thing as a free lunch. In this context, they are correct. Just as one cannot reduce the budget deficit by cutting taxes, one cannot subject EPA to major funding cuts without severely undermining its effetiveness. But documenting this requires some digging, especially since the administration has a variety of clever rebuttals to offer. Confronted, for example, with the harsh fact of a 20 percent reduction in its enforcement budget, EPA officials counter by claiming that the agency will pursue fewer but more significant cases, getting more bang for fewer environmental bucks. Skeptics who point to the growing backlog of delayed regulations required under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Toxic Substances Control Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and Clean Water Act are told that the delays are not budget related but are due instead to the sorry state of regulatory affairs inherited from the previous administration. Impacts of budget cuts in other environmental areas are dismissed by administration officials on the basis of wanting to transfer traditional areas of EPA responsibility to the states, "who are closer to the problem."

But reviews of specific EPA budget cuts undertaken by my Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee belie the administration's pledge of cuts without pain. They point to a concerted effort to target specific cuts to areas most vulnerable to underfunding, thereby crippling the EPA's ability to protect the environment.

The pattern we detect at EPA is not that of cutting the budget and trying to make do. Instead, it is a matter of deciding politically which programs to kill or cripple, then cynically using the budget as a justification for those political decisions.

Concerned over the increasing discharge of toxic chemicals into rivers, streams and lakes, Congress amended the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in 1972. Standards were to be set by EPA for the discharge of industrial toxics into the nation's surface waters. The development of the required "end-of-the-pipe" standards and a list of specific toxics to be controlled was as difficult as it was controversial. Following dozens of congressional and agency hearings and conflicting legal challenges, parties to the litigation, including the Natural Resources Defense Council, the National Coal Association, and EPA, entered into a consent decree in 1976. The decree required the establishment of effluent limitation standards based on increasingly stringent levels of control for 21 categories of major industrial dischargers and 65 specific toxic pollutants.

That agreement was strongly endorsed by Congress in the 1977 amendments to the Clean Water Act. As the courts subsequently noted, Congress by that action "intended for the agreement to remain in effect to supply the missing details of a cohesive strategy for controlling toxic water pollution."

Following some false starts and misdirection, EPA had developed, by the final year of the Carter administration, an integrated, comprehensive toxics control strategy that included proposed effluent limitation guidelines, pretreatment standards, toxic water quality standards and a complimentary research and development program. Together those initiatives would have enabled EPA and industry to meet the congressionally-mandated deadlines during 1981 for a much needed industrial toxic discharge control program.

The 1976 consent decree was not initially targeted for review by the in-coming Reagan administration, but it quickly became an object of administration concern. Last March, Vice-President Bush wrote a letter to industry officials asking those "with direct experience with the effects of government regulations (to) inform the (appropriate) agency . . . of instances in which these regulations should be changed to increase the benefits or decrease the cost of regulation." But neither the Bush regulatory task force nor EPA thought it appropriate to elicit comment from environmental and health experts or from state government.

Industry leaders and lobbyists were quick to target the 1976 consent decree on toxic discharges for oblivion or major modification. An iron and steel industry group in a letter to EPA described it as a "relic" that should be vacated. And a Washington law firm representing the "Who's Who" of the chemical industry—Allied, Dow, Exxon, Dupont, Monsanto, and Union Carbide—urged that the decree be vacated or significantly modified, because it might not reflect current administration policy.

An EPA analysis of the industry's position concluded that, given EPA's statutory obligations, the court would be unlikely to agree to abandoning the decree altogether but that it might be possible to extend the deadlines for promulgating the toxic guidelines. Accordingly, Administrator Gorsuch was advised to ask the court for "an extended, stretched out schedule justified by resource constraints." In other words, having decided for tactical reasons not to challenge the consent decree directly, EPA sought to satisfy industry by delaying implementation of the decree on grounds that it did not have the funds to meet the original schedule.

Following this strategy, the director of the Office of Water Regulations and Standards, in a sworn affidavit, advised the court that "the number of personnel and budget allocated to the program are being reduced" to such an extent as to require a delay in the issuance of toxic discharge standards. Specifically, he indicated that contractor and personnel funds were the most important budget items for implementing the consent decree. Yet, contractor funds alone were to be cut 48 percent for the 1982 fiscal year with additional cuts expected for 1983. EPA urged the court to extend the deadlines for the final promulgation of regulations governing toxic industrial dischargers from 13 to 44 months. In addition, EPA asked to exclude seven industrial categories from regulation and to be free of the requirement to identify areas of the country where water quality problems might be so severe that even the highest level of technical controls might not protect drinking water supplies.

The agency seriously undermined its credibility by those statements. EPA officials, while advising the court that EPA could not honor the consent decree because of budgetary problems, were insisting in sworn testimony before congressional committees that the work of the agency would not be undercut by its proposed budget reductions.

Meanwhile, in a further effort to undermine the toxics discharge program, EPA proposed an additional 44 percent cut in the research and development program necessary to support that effort. According to an internal EPA memorandum, the "needed technical base" for the toxics program "could be completed but not field validated by approximately 1990," if the cuts went through. If this is the case, it is reasonable to assume there will not be a full toxics discharge program until the end of the century. As a consequence, according to the same budget memorandum, "significant water quality problems" will be ignored, since we "may or may not know what or where [the] worst water pollution problems are."

Examples of how EPA, in cooperation with industry, has targeted specific programs for destruction through delay and financial strangulation could fill this entire issue. Perhaps the only unique feature about EPA's decision to destroy the toxic discharge program is the well-documented pattern of agency duplicity revealed in its internal memoranda, court filings and public testimony.●

DEFICITS DO MATTER

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as we confront the difficult task of preparing a budget for fiscal year 1983, let us remember that—contrary to recent pronouncements emanating from the

President's Council of Economic Advisors—deficits do matter. They matter very much. That is the compelling conclusion of a recent New York Times article—January 10, 1982—written by William Galston, an associate professor of government at the University of Texas. I wholeheartedly endorse his conclusions and share his concern.

There is no miracle in a balance budget, but there is a clear and present danger to the projected levels of Federal borrowing for the immediate years ahead. When housing starts fall to a 35-year low, when the auto industry operates at 50 percent of capacity, when mortgage interest rates hover at 17 percent, when capital investment stagnates, deficits do matter. They matter very much.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert Mr. Galston's article into the Record for the benefit of my colleagues:

DEFICITS DO MATTER

(By William A. Galston)

New Haven.—Even if the President accedes to the selective tax increases urged by his senior economic advisers, the Federal Government will incur huge deficits for the remainder of his Administration. The willingness to tolerate unbalanced budgets betrays a principle that Ronald Reagan has espoused throughout his political career. Worse, it is wrong in theory and dangerous in practice. Whatever supply-side economists may say, deficits do matter.

To begin with, deficits raise operating costs. If the Government runs a deficit of $100 billion and borrows to pay its bills, then (assuming an average interest rate of 12 percent) annual expenditures are $12 billion higher than if taxes had been increased to cover the deficit. And because the debt is never repaid, this extra expense is incurred not once but every year in perpetuity.

Second, deficits breed deficits. By boosting annual interest payments, each successive deficit increases the difficulty of achieving a balanced budget and forces the Government to borrow more, just to cover the interest on the debt. If projected deficits totaling more than $300 billion are not slashed further, interest costs will rise by at least $40 billion between now and 1984. As the economist Alan Greenspan has said, "Unless we rein in the forces of deficit expansion, they could proceed in a geometric fashion."

Third, deficits spur inflation. Some economists contend that as long as the Government does not "monetize" the deficit—that is, as long as it sells bonds for money already in circulation rather than printing new money—it will increase neither the money supply nor the inflation rate. But this argument rests on an unrealistically narrow understanding of what constitutes "money."

Everyone knows that the Federal Government will never retire the bonds it issues. Rather, these bonds will be rolled over—reissued at the prevailing interest rate—as they come due. Thus, Government bonds become a kind of money, an additional way of making claims on future goods and services. To expand the permanent national debt is to increase demand. Unless the supply of goods and services rises commensurately, the result can only be higher inflation.

Fourth, deficits raise interest rates. If, as the Adminstration contends, the substitution of deficit-induced borrowing for taxation will accelerate economic activity, it will surely raise the private sector's demand for capital. Private and public-sector borrowing requirements will then collide, sending interest rates soaring, unless the deficit diminishes at least as much as private demand increases—an improbable combination at best.

Supply-siders offer two arguments, not always clearly distinguished from each other, in support of deficits that stem from tax reductions.

First, they argue that by augmenting the capital available for private investment, the money not taken in taxes will stimulate economic growth, increasing the Government's revenue base and moving the budget toward balance at lower tax rates. But this contention is invalid. If the Government must borrow what it has not appropriated in taxes, then these funds are not available for private investment after all. What the Government gives with one hand, it takes back with the other.

Second, supply-siders argue that lower tax rates are designed to increase—and will increase—incentives for innovative entrepreneurs, who are ultimately responsible for higher productivity and growth but whose activities have been discouraged by burdensome taxation.

This contention is probably true—but, how true? Just to recover the added interest costs stemming from the tax-reduction deficits, these tax breaks would have to increase the overall growth rate of our $3 trillion economy, which averaged 3 percent over the past decade, by nearly one-half. A jump of this magnitude is highly improbable, especially since much of the tax reduction is going to individuals who are not now and will not be induced to become entrepreneurs.

Supply-siders have urged Mr. Reagan to discard traditional economic conservatism in favor of a new strategy—one that is more in tune, they argue, with political realities as well as with the requirements of economic growth. But this "new" strategy is just the latest version of our political system's perennial vice: the avoidance of hard choices.

Unless President Reagan has the courage to reaffirm his long-held conviction that deficits do matter, and to draw the necessary conclusions for his tax policy as well as his spending program, he will lock the economy on course toward an economic Dunkirk.●

MONETARY POLICY, DEFICITS AND INTEREST RATES

HON. WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, all of us seem to be in agreement that interest rates must come down if we are to embark upon a course of sustained economic growth and national recovery from inflation and unemployment. Lately, however, there have been vast disagreements over the source of upward pressure on interest rates and what to do to bring interest rates under control.

I sincerely regret that the waters were somewhat muddied by the recent comments of Treasury Secretary Donald Regan, in which he blamed the Federal Reserve Board for high interest rates. Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman from California is no apologist for the Fed. On many occasions, in public remarks and private correspondence, I have called some of the actions of the Fed into question. However, we do ourselves a disservice by blaming the Fed for responding to the economic conditions that we in the Congress and the executive branch have created through our irresponsible fiscal policies.

The primary cause of excessive interest rates, in my judgment, rests with deficit spending in two ways. First, the borrowing necessary to cover the deficit, if not accommodated by an expansion of the money supply, will drive up interest rates by absorbing a large percentage of the available credit. Second, if the increased Federal borrowing is partially or entirely accommodated, inflationary expectations will cause investors to demand an "inflation premium" in their interest rate determinations. Blaming the Federal Reserve is akin to shooting the messenger out of anger over the content of the message.

Do we really want the Federal Reserve to artificially push interest rates lower through an inflationary expansion of the money supply? Any relief would be short lived. As noted a few moments ago, the ultimate response from the Nation's financial markets would be an increase in interest rates, not to mention a fueling of inflation.

In all candor, we must stop blaming the Fed, and start looking in the mirror at ourselves. We cannot continue to tolerate, promote, or sanction record levels of deficit spending, and then divert attention away from the source of the economic consequences that follow.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Paul Volcker testified before the Joint Economic Committee on Tuesday, January 26, 1982. In his prepared statement, he noted:

> Paradoxical as it may seem, action by the Administration and the Congress to bring spending and our revenue potential into closer balance—and ultimately into balance and surplus—as the economy expands can be a major element, through its implications for credit markets, in promoting recovery and nurturing it. Credibility in the budget, through its effects on expectations and behavior, could only work toward lower interest rates and speeding the disinflationary process.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Chairman Volcker's statement, as it relates to Federal deficits and interest rates, is important. Therefore, I would like to insert the full text of that portion of his comments at this point in the Record:

STATEMENT BY PAUL A. VOLCKER, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Obviously, it is far too soon to claim victory in the fight on inflation. To make that prospect a reality, properly restrained and cautious monetary policy will continue to be required. And at the same time, we need to combine that anti-inflation effort with policies that will encourage and sustain the recovery process. The linkage lies in considerable part in encouraging favorable developments in financial markets and interest rates, and there are critical implications for the mix of governmental policies. An inadequate balance in policies can add to financial stress, with severe consequences for vulnerable credit-dependent sectors of the economy—consequences most dramatically reflected in homebuilding and the problems of many small businessmen and farmers. Moreover, our need to improve and modernize our plant and equipment is evident. That need lay behind many of the tax changes enacted last year; but overburdening monetary policy in dealing with inflation, with consequences for financial pressures in the marketplace, can work against that very objective.

This year we will have a very large Federal deficit. To the extent that deficit is a passive reflection of recession— which in turn reduces other credit demands—even that deficit may be manageable without, in itself, standing in the way of a more favorable financing climate. The large Federal contribution to the income stream—including the second stage of the tax cut at mid-year—should help buoy economic activity. But during a period of recovery, deficits approaching the current magnitude would have quite another implication; in an environment of limited monetary expansion and rising private demands for credit, they would threaten prolonged strain and congestion in financial markets, with strongly adverse consequences for other borrowers. And those consequences are not merely a hypothetical possibility for the future. It is that concern that preoccupies the thinking of many potential investors in the market today, making them reluctant to commit funds for any long period of time, fearful that interest rates may not decline or could even rise.

You and I may think those concerns overdone, particularly in the light of the extraordinarily high level of rates today in relation to the prospects for inflation. But the lesson for policy seems to me unambiguous. Fiscal action needs to be directed toward the progressive and substantial reduction of the deficit as recovery proceeds.

We know there is a deep-seated public instinct associating large deficits with inflation, and a great deal of history pointing in that direction. We could also engage in abstract debate about whether budgetary deficits are necessarily inherently inflationary, and the point would be advanced that, given sufficiently severe monetary policy, they might not be. But that would imply far higher interest rates, lower investment, and poorer economic performance generally. Paradoxical as it may seem, action by the Administration and the Congress to bring spending and our revenue potential into closer balance—and ultimately into balance and surplus—as the economy expands can be a major element, through its implications for credit markets, in promoting recovery and nurturing it. Credibility in the budget, through its effects on expectations and behavior, could only work toward lower interest rates and speeding the disinflationary process.

In essence, the burden of my comments is that the need for disciplined financial policies to carry through the anti-inflation effort is not lessened by the current recession. It's not just a matter of the longer-run—to back away from the commitment to deal with inflation would be a disturbing matter for financial markets today, complicating the prospects for early recovery.

Interest rates fell appreciably last fall, and most have remained substantially below earlier peaks. But in both real and nominal terms, they remain extraordinarily high. The fact is markets remain sensitive, disturbed, and uncertain despite the encouraging trend toward less inflation. We cannot wish these doubts and skepticism about the future away; we can act to dispel them by our actions.

That, of course, has important implications for monetary policy. As I indicated at the outset, I will deal more specifically with our intentions with respect to monetary growth after the Federal Open Market Committee, in the normal course, meets next week to adopt guidelines for the coming year. The basic thrust of policy will remain one of encouraging continued progress on the inflation front. With such progress, there should be adequate financial resources to support renewed economic growth.

Present economic conditions are those of pain and hardship for many. In working to relieve them, let us not forget the basic circumstances that brought on the difficulty. Let us take heart from the signs of progress in turning the corner toward greater price stability. We can build on that progress, and, in doing so, restore the confidence and financial condition so critical to recovery.●

POPE JOHN PAUL II'S MESSAGE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I bring greetings to the House and to the American people from Pope John Paul II. His Holiness met with a group of six House Members during our recent visit to Rome, and he generously spent his time with us, speaking in English about our responsibility as American lawmakers to be courageous advocates for human rights, for justice, and for peace. His comments are pointed and very pertinent to us as we begin to deal with the issues before the 2d session of the 97th Congress.

He said:

Dear Congressmen, dear friends from the United States, in my message for the world day of peace this year, I addressed my words explicitly to the men and women who today bear responsibility for life in society. Since you are among those belonging to this important category of people at the service of peace, I am very happy to speak to you personally this morning and to welcome you to the Vatican.

Peace is without doubt a gift of God. But because it is entrusted to us, peace is also linked with human justice, which in turn is fostered through sound structures of law and through the dedicated and diligent activities of legislators. As Congressmen you are in a position to offer an eminent form of service to your fellow citizens. You are in a position to help build legal structures that reflect justice and thereby promote peace. Moreover, the structures that you build can be a lasting contribution.

The service that you perform can benefit not only your own country but also society in general. The measures that you take in Congress affect the lives of millions of Americans. They likewise touch the well-being of people throughout the world; the enactments of your Congress can give fraternal support to whole sectors of mankind and can sustain the hope of entire peoples.

You are called upon to champion human dignity within your country and beyond its boundaries. You are called to be courageous advocates of human rights—especially those inalienable rights proclaimed by your own Declaration of Independence: The right to life, liberty and the pursuit of hapiness. To defend and protect human life, to help all your brothers and sisters live as free people pursuing that true happiness willed for them by the Creator—this is indeed a splendid mission.

Last Saturday I had occasion to mention to the diplomatic corps accredited to the Holy See that present times and difficult. But I also added: the forces for good are greater. I believe that your role as Congressmen gives you immense opportunities to do good in many ways: As trusted and truthful servants of the public, as defenders of freedom, as proponents of justice, as supporters of life, as friends of the poor—and thus as real peacemakers promoting human rights.

All of this is the best tradition of your land—in the American way of life. Again, as your Declaration of Independence states, it is in order to secure these rights that governments are instituted among men. Or, as a distinguished American, Thomas Jefferson, to whom I referred during my address on the Mall in Washington—once said: "The care of human life and happiness and not their destruction is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

Ladies and gentlemen, the challenge is great and can be deeply fulfilling. You are called to contribute effectively to the destiny of America and to the future of the world. "May God sustain you in this important task of service in the true cause of human rights, of it's liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Thank you for your visit.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan had asked me to express his support and appreciation to the Pope for His Holiness' statements on behalf of the Polish Solidarity struggle. The Pope graciously accepted this message.

The meeting with the Pope was an important stop on a well-rounded visit in which we had many discussions with top Italian Government leaders on the future of our NATO alliance. Some of those we spent time with were Alessandro Pertini, President of the Republic; Mrs. Iotti, Chairman of the Chamber of Deputies; Mr. Fanfani, Chairman of the Senate; Giuli Andreotti, Member of the Chamber of Deputies; and Emilio Colombo, Italy's Foreign Minister.

Our delegation also extensively examined Italian aerospace facilities to obtain a better understanding of Italy's defense capabilities as a NATO partner.

One of the most rewarding segments of our mission was when we signed a project agreement between the United States and Italian Governments for building homes and schools in Potensa with funds that were appropriated by the U.S. Congress. Potenza is in the southern region of Italy which was devastated by an earthquake in 1980. Our delegation also traveled to the Friuli region to dedicate projects for senior citizens that were built with other American funds after two 1976 earthquakes left thousands homeless.

Mr. Speaker, one of the many lasting impressions we gained during this trip was that the Italian people have not forgotten the generosity and kindness of the American people during their times of crisis. The feelings of friendship and loyalty that abide between our two peoples form a bond that will be a great strength to both countries.●

PENSION LIABILITY IS CAUSING PROBLEMS TO AMERICA'S TRUCKING INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1981, I introduced H.R. 5223, a bill designed to correct the numerous problems that have arisen through the passage of the Multi-Employer Pension Plan Amendments Act of 1980. Today, I am pleased to announce that three of my colleagues, Tom Hagedorn of Minnesota, Ike Andrews and Eugene Johnston of North Carolina, have joined in cosponsoring this legislation.

Although many industry groups have felt the sting of the act, none has been more devastatingly impacted than the trucking industry. Nearly 2 years ago, this body passed the Motor Carrier Act of 1980 which, as we all know, was intended to provide for more competitive and efficient operation in the motor carrier industry. However, in order to achieve this goal, motor carriers must be allowed to respond to market conditions by selling, buying and moving capital. This condition, a competitive atmosphere in which companies can freely transfer assets, is being seriously threatened by legislation enacted 4 months after passage of the Motor Carrier Act. The Multi-Employer Pension Plan Amendments Act of 1980 imposes severe withdrawal liabilities whenever the employer sells his business, moves a terminal, or engages in any of a number of normal business transactions. By hampering regular business operations, it has also threatened the wellbeing of the trucking industry, its employees, and their pension plans.

This problem was well articulated in the January 7, 1982 Journal of Commerce editorial, which I have inserted in the Record. It notes that the 1980 amendments act requires that companies be assessed up to 100 percent of their net worth when withdrawing from pension plans, which is defined in ways ranging from going out of business, to moving a terminal. All of this makes it impossible for a firm to go out of business.

A similar measure has been introduced in the Senate. It is my understanding the Senate Labor Committee will hold hearings on this issue in early March. I believe it is imperative the House begin its deliberations to find an effective answer to this problem.

[From The Journal of Commerce, Jan. 7, 1982]

ADDING TO TRUCKERS WOES

The easing of regulation and a faltering economy have taken a heavy toll of the nation's trucking industry, resulting in a rash of bankruptcies and lost jobs. But, like Job, the industry will get yet another severe test if the law governing multiemployer pension plans is not changed.

The 1980 amendments to the Employee Retirement and Income Security Act may require firms withdrawing from a pension plan to pay up to 100 percent of their net worth to the plan. This represents a significant change from earlier legislation that introduced a 30 percent net worth liability limit for employers if a pension plan is terminated.

This change reflected, in turn, events leading up to the imposition of outside management for the Teamsters Central States Pension Fund in 1977, following allegations that union officials and others had looted the funds.

The truckers, and other industry groups, want this legislation changed because they contend that it fosters inefficiency, making it impossible, for example, to withdraw from uncompetitive markets. Above all it inhibits the free workings of the market, the very object of decontrol, because it makes it virtually impossible for a firm to go out of business.

Industry analysts have been saying that some firms are continuing to operate, despite losses, because of the ominous size of their insurance liabilities. They can point to the effort by the Central States Pension Fund to collect nearly three times the net worth of Johnson Motor Lines and a similar effort by the Teamsters to collect almost twice the assets of the Transport Motor Express as examples.

William M. Legg, vice president of Alex Brown & Sons, charged recently that trucking firms are "cannibalizing themselves" because of their potential liabilities to the pension funds.

At the same time, the access to capital by the smaller trucking firms could be severely inhibited by the proposal by the Financial Accounting Standards Board to require carriers to footnote their potential pension liabilities on their financial statements.

Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, encouraged in his efforts by the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, has seen the problem and has introduced legislation to begin dealing with it. He has in mind exempting employers who have negotiated contribution levels before April 29, 1980, from the withdrawal and plan termination provisions of the Multiemployers Pension Act of 1980.

His and other proposals, including the return to a 30 percent liability for carriers wishing to relocate, should be given a serious hearing by the administration this year. Otherwise, the whole intent of deregulation will be buried, in large part because of well-meaning but unfortunate legislation.●

PARE LORENTZ

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to have been associated with Mr. Pare Lorentz for many years. This dedicated author has compiled the most outstanding written testimonial and history of the life of Franklin Delano Roosevelt of any individual in the United States. Working with his own resources, Mr. Lorentz has made an unparalleled effort to document events in F. D. R.'s life which all Americans should share.

In the past, the Congress has attempted to provide funds to purchase Mr. Lorentz' work. It was my strong view that during this day of celebration of the 100th anniversary of F. D. R.'s birth, the Congress could provide the American people with Mr. Lorentz' book by purchasing and publishing the book. We are only speaking of spending $1.8 million on what is clearly an invaluable historical document. In the name of saving money, we should not excuse ourselves from this dereliction of our duty.

I would like to share with my colleagues an article from the January 24, 1982, edition of the Reporter Dispatch, a Westchester newspaper, which describes the life and work of Pare Lorentz. Perhaps a reading of this material will help convince my colleagues that Mr. Lorentz' work must be published.

The article follows:

[From the Gannett Westchester Newspapers, Jan. 24, 1982]

ARMONK FILMMAKER'S WORK UNSEEN

(By Bruce Frankel)

Locked in the back of a closet, in hidden notebooks and boxes, is one remembrance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt that no one will see on the 100th anniversary of his birth this week.

Thirty-five years ago, Pare Lorentz of Armonk—a pioneer of the documentary film—began an enduring effort to preserve the memory of FDR.

He began writing, compiling anecdotes, collecting photographs and spending more than $185,000 out of his own pocket to create a day-by-day account of FDR's life: *The Days of Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Chronicle.*

He has amassed 3,718 typewritten pages and 5,627 photographs, covering every year of FDR's life. Included are interviews with family, friends and colleagues, some no longer alive, describing everything from FDR's study habits and penchant for "having a good time" at Harvard to his first temptation to enter politics.

To place FDR's life in its context, Lorentz counterpoints it in a companion to the chronology with national and world events, such as these entries for Sept. 12, 1932: FDR kicks off his first presidential campaign and heads for Topeka, Kan., to speak on farm relief. Gangland-figure Geraldo Scarpato is found dead in a sack in Brooklyn. Chancellor von Papen dissolves the German parliament, which had voted "no confidence" in his government. And France denies Germany's request for direct discussion of Germany's military status under the Treaty of Versailles.

Lorents originally hoped the work would by published commercially. But the red and black binder, folders, photographs and interview transcripts remain stored in a closet in his study, unseen except by a few.

On the recommendation of John B. Rhoads, then archivist of the United States, Lorentz went to Capitol Hill three years ago to try to persuade Congress to buy and publish the work as a Roosevelt Centennial project and place the original at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library in Hyde Park.

Lorentz, a native West Virginian, asked Sen. Jennings Randolph, D-W.Va., to offer and joint resolution proposing the project and a centennial celebration. Along with Rep. Jim Wright, D-Texas, he did, but it never made it out of the Rules Committee of the 96th Congress.

Last spring, a similar resolution to purchase, but not publish, the work was offered in the House with 123 co-sponsors, and in the Senate with 43 co-signers. Nothing happened.

Then, on Nov. 24, 1981, as the time for Congress to act on any proposal to commemorate Roosevelt's birthday was quickly vanishing, Congress voted to celebrate the centennial with a joint session this Wednesday and $25,000 worth of entertainment for itself. The congressional celebration will include a lecture by historian Arthur Schlesinger Jr., a song by opera star Leontyne Price and excerpts from Roosevelt's recorded speeches.

A 920-word preamble about FDR's accomplishments, written by Lorentz for the original resolution, was replaced by two innocuous paragraphs.

To some, such a paltry commemoration by America's lawmakers on the centennial of the nation's only four-term president is a national disgrace; to others, it is simply a sign that Congress is intent on saving taxpayer dollars.

Republican Rep. Hamilton Fish Jr., whose district includes the Roosevelt home in Hyde Park, called it "an embarrassment and an indignity to the memory of a man who helped to restore faith in our country's institutions through two historic circumstances—the Depression and World War II."

Fish was disheartened, moreover, because Congress had failed to pay tribute to Roosevelt by allocating the $1.8 million that would have been required two years ago to purchase and publish the Lorentz chronology in time for the centennial.

"It is our responsibility," he said, "that the American people are able to share—in the midst of all-encompassing budget cuts—in the commemoration of this great president who epitomized hope during the most uncertain conditions . . . (It) is a personal disappointment and the nation's loss."

Lorentz, of course, shared Fish's disappointment. Not that Lorentz was looking for any profit. He wanted only to be compensated for his own expenses.

Last week, standing in his study, lined with books about the nation by authors hired by Roosevelt's public works programs during the Depression, Lorentz mused with a detailed recall of events, colorful language and wit tinged with a sense of loss.

"It's a shame that what you have is a nation of bookkeepers and body-counters, already accepting the next horror . . . with no interest in creating an ebulient spirit, proud of a national history," he said.

"Roosevelt thought in terms of history," he said, pulling from a bookshelf one of 15 volumes of Samuel Eliot Morison's History of U.S. Naval Operation in World War II. "He called Morison in and had these written to carry on a feeling of continuity of our history and some of its majesty."

Lorentz also pointed to Roosevelt's love of the written word as a reason why Congress should have published the work: Before he became president, Roosevelt wrote 41 articles, essays and historical brochures, and often wrote prefaces to books that pleased him—histories of the Hudson River, the Navy, whaling-ship history. He graduated from Harvard in 1903, but stayed on an extra year after he was elected president of the Crimson.

Lorentz testified at the hearings, "I feel my work reflects the man: It is outsize but it is easy and comfortable with no frill and flourishes as was the president's Hudson River home, his farm, the boats in which he sailed, and above all the manner in which he reported to his fellow Americans."

When Lorentz began his project in 1947, he was under contract to Harper & Bros. (now Harper & Row) Publishers to bring together a photographic chronicle. He quickly found that the market would be glutted with "quickie" histories and accounts of Roosevelt, who had died in 1945. Already such hastily written books were trying to capitalize on Roosevelt's death. Lorentz determined instead to create a more enduring document, and returned his advance money to Harper.

Encouraged by Eleanor Roosevelt, the president's widow, Lorentz hired a small staff and set to work.

Lorentz had already focused his energy on Roosevelt in 1934, when he wrote *The Roosevelt Year: 1933*, hailed as an innovative history because of its dramatic layout of news clippings and running headlines.

Lorentz also had a special feeling for Roosevelt. In turn, Roosevelt had been a fan of Lorentz's films, including *The Plow That Broke the Plain*, an account of the Dust Bowl that drew nationwide attention to the young film critic's first movie. His second film, *The River*, a history of the Mississippi River Basin and the effect of the Tennessee Valley Authority on the area, again illustrated the documentary's power to prompt widespread discussion.

This time, to establish a perspective not found in other presidential chronologies, Lorentz decided to set events in EDR's life side-by-side with simultaneous events in the United States and abroad. By using this counterpoint technique in his *Franklin D. Roosevelt: His Life and Times*, Lorentz created a companion for his traditional chronology of FDR's life.

"I've always been discontented with those historians who concentrate in narrow corridors and do not regard other events which have bearings on the history of the persons or nations they discuss," he said.

Most of Lorentz's work on the chronology was completed by 1952. A series of publishing companies expressed interest. Editors changed houses. The project languished. The climate of the nation changed radically. The effects of the McCarthy era lingered.

His detractors in that era were persuaded that Roosevelt had sold out to Stalin in peace-making after World War II by agreeing to the division of Germany, the carving up of Europe and the partitioning of Korea.

In April 1957, Mrs. Roosevelt forwarded to Lorentz a letter from her son, James, then a California congressman. Referring to the federal government's possible purchase of the chronology, he had written: "Frankly, in the present mood of the Congress, there just isn't any chance of its being agreed to, and I think it would be better not to try it."

Not until 1979 did Lorentz appear before Congress to plead for the publication of his work. He told the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration that because the Delano and Roosevelt families were close-knit and their members kept diaries, it had been possible to create a chronology that surpassed the Lincoln Chronology, the only presidential chronology published by the government.

William R. Emerson, director of the FDR Library in Hyde Park, testified in support of the Government's acquiring and publishing the Lorentz's chronology.

"Chronologies of the lives of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln were published . . . and are now collectors' items. Both Franklin Roosevelt and, perhaps more to the point, the American public, deserve no less."

Emerson said no other work on FDR rivaled Lorentz's in its comprehensiveness, and pressed for its publication.

The Senate committee authorized Elmer E. Cornwell, Jr., a professor at Brown University, to evaluate Lorentz's work. In May 1980, he reported that the work was flawed by the absence of information—such as the desk diaries of FDR and his secretaries—which had become available in the years since Lorentz finished working on the chronology.

He said a plethora of information—lists of all appointments and meetings, the records of hour-by-hour activities at the White House and nearly 1,000 press conferences Roosevelt had held during his 12 years in office—might still be added to what Lorentz had done.

Flawed though it might be, Cornwell still believed that it would be useful to scholars and recommended that the committee give serious consideration to acquiring it and donating it to the Hyde Park library.

Most senators and congressmen blamed the failure of the proposal to get out of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee on the price tag of the project, especially in a time of intense efforts to cut back government spending.

James Hemphill, who serves as executive assistant to Sen. Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., said this week, "I don't think it was any big deal. The line of questioning was 'Why should the government publish a private collection at the taxpayer's expense? There's already been a lot of work on Roosevelt. Why should they single out this work?'"

Lorentz, now 77, with his gravelly voice and West Virginia twang, was ready with a passionate rebuttal:

"That's meaningless. He has no idea of the work. It's no more a private collection than this," he said, thrusting three blue volumes of the government's chronicle of Abraham Lincoln's life. The books were purchased from the Abraham Lincoln Association and published in 1960 by the government under the auspices of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission for an estimated cost of more than $1 million.

"Or this," he said, picking up a thick paperback "Herbert Hoover Reassessed." It was published by the government last year at a cost of $121,000. The foreword is written by Sen. Hatfield.

In 1974, Congress approved spending $7.4 million to build a centennial monument to Hoover, the man "who created the Depression" and whom Roosevelt defeated for the presidency, Lorents added.

Frugality in honoring famous presidents is not an American tradition.

The George Washington bicentennial in 1932 was a clamorous and costly affair, with an average of 16,000 separate bicentennial events every day during the nine-month celebration. The official bicentennial commission's final report alone occupied five volumes. The American Tree Association planted 35 million trees in Washington's honor. The government issued 12 Washington postage stamps, seven billion of which were bought in 1932 alone, bringing the government a $1 million profit.

The first Roosevelt Centennial—cousin Theodore's—in 1958 included the greatest fireworks display the capital ever seen.

But as Lorentz has found, honoring Franklin D. Roosevelt remains a prickly and difficult mission. He remains almost as controversial today as when he was president.

A site for an FDR memorial was established years ago on the "Cherry Walk" along the Tidal Basin, between the Lincoln and Jefferson memorials, and more than $480,000 has been spent by Congress on three designs. The cost of constructing a scaled-down version of the monument is estimated at $23 million. But Congress has yet to authorize money for construction.

While $23 million may sound like a lot, it is substantially less than what was paid for other presidential memorials. The Washington Monument cost about $4[illegible].2 million and the Lincoln Memorial $37.9 million. The Jefferson Memorial cost $37.9 million to construct.

Though President Ronald Reagan looked to FDR for inspiration for his acceptance speech at the Republican convention in 1980, Reagan's contribution to the centennial is expected to be muted. In fact, the State Department is refusing to allow FDR exhibits in U.S. embassies and consulates.

The Smithsonian Institution, with a special congressional appropriation of $200,000—the only organization with federal backing for an FDR celebration—has scheduled a series of events that will focus on Roosevelt as "a master communicator."

To a large extent, Peter Kovler, a 29-year-old writer and heir to the Jim Beam distillery, has emerged as the centennial's savior, rallying organizations such as the Smithsonian to prepare what programs will take place.

"When I started looking at it, no one else was doing anything," Kovler has said.

Such statements make Lorentz bristle. He calls Kovler "a hustler."

Lorentz, who now hopes to find a private source for the publication of his work, remains convinced that politics and indifference, not money, are at the root of the failure by Congress to buy his work.

"Money is a good alibi because we have stringent times—so stringent that (Congress) gave itself a raise and made second homes in Washington, D.C., tax-exempt. The problem was that it (the $1.8 million) was so little money, it got no respect.

"No one ever said they wanted to see my canceled checks," he said. "Not one person wanted to see the work in person, though the background of those in Congress would suggest that they might have an interest in history.

"They displayed a total indifference to the man and the New Deal . . . It is tragic to have men interested only in the day-to-day affairs, in who's on first. At no time, anywhere, did I encounter any enthusiasm."

"It has been a bitter business," Lorentz wrote to a friend recently. "But when one reviews the shabby, dishonest, indolent and dangerous actions of this 97th Congress, I am only a part of a picture of what has been a record that will go down in political history as one of the worst our country ever has endured."●

NAFCU SUPPORTS BANKRUPTCY CHANGES

HON. BILLY LEE EVANS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to speak to my colleagues on the subject of bankruptcy and how it affects financial institutions, specifically credit unions. I had the pleasure of addressing the annual Congressional Caucus of the National Association of Federal Credit Unions—the only national association exclusively representing the interests of federally chartered credit unions—this week. There seems to be a great concern among Federal credit union members regarding the effect of bankruptcies on the future of consumer credit for qualified borrowers with legitimate credit needs.

For many borrowers, their credit union is often the only source of consumer credit at anything less than usurious rates. It is my belief, and that of the credit union leaders I met with this morning, that the alarming increase in bankruptcy filings is due, at least in part, to certain provisions of the Bankruptcy Code of 1978. There is an increasing amount of evidence that suggests that this act does not provide the proper balance between debtors and creditors.

In September 1981, the results of a survey conducted by the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) to determine the impact of the 1978 Bankruptcy Code on loan chargeoffs at Federal credit unions was published. It was determined that 53 percent of credit union chargeoffs due to bankruptcy were attributed to the more liberal provisions of the Bankruptcy Code. When these loan chargeoffs occur at credit unions the entire membership is penalized.

A prime example of this occurred at Navy Federal Credit Union, which is the largest credit union in the country. In 1980, the first full year of operation under the new code, there was a 60-percent rise in loan chargeoffs at Navy Federal Credit Union. This resulted in a drain on assets that worked out to approximately $5 per member.

The net result the increase in bankruptcies is having on consumers can be recognized not only in reduced dividends, but also through higher loan rates and more restrictive loan policies.

I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4786, which I believe addresses some areas for improvement of the current Bankruptcy Code. It is my hope that I will have the full support of my colleagues when this bill comes to the House floor later this year.

I urge those who are not yet supporting this measure to do so. I would like to include in the Record at this time a list of my distinguished colleagues who presently are listed as cosponsors of this important legislation, along with my thanks for their support.

Anderson, Glenn M.
Andrews, Ike
Anthony, Beryl, Jr.
Archer, Bill
Ashbrook, John M.
Atkinson, Eugene V.
Badham, Robert E.
Bailey, Don
Bailey, Wendell
Barnard, Doug, Jr.
Beard, Robin L.
Benedict, Cleve
Bethune, Ed
Bevill, Tom
Bliley, Tom
Bouquard, Marilyn Lloyd
Bowen, David R.
Breaux, John B.
Brinkley, Jack
Brown, Hank
Broyhill, James T.
Byron, Beverly B.
Campbell, Carroll A., Jr.
Carman, Greg
Chappell, Bill, Jr.
Chappie, Gene
Cheney, Richard Bruce
Coats, Daniel R.
Coelho, Tony
Collins, James M.
Courter, James A.
Coyne, James K.
Craig, Larry
Crane, Daniel B.
Crane, Philip M.
Daniel, Dan
Daschle, Thomas A.
Daub, Hal
Deckard, H. Joel
Derrick, Butler
Dickinson, William L.
Donnelly, Brian J.
Dowdy, Wayne
Dreier, David
Dwyer, Bernard J.
Dyson, Roy
Edgar, Bob
Edwards, Jack
Edwards, Mickey
Emerson, Bill
Emery, David F.
English, Glenn
Erdahl, Arlen
Evans, Cooper
Evans, David W.
Evans, Thomas B., Jr.
Fauntroy, Walter E.
Fazio, Vic
Fithian, Floyd J.
Flippo, Ronnie G.
Florio, James J.
Forsythe, Edwin B.
Fountain, L. H.
Gingrich, Newt
Ginn, Bo
Glickman, Dan
Gradison, Willis D., Jr.
Gray, William H., III
Gregg, Judd
Grisham, Wayne
Gunderson, Steve
Hall, Ralph M.
Hall, Sam B., Jr.
Hall, Tony P.
Hance, Kent
Hansen, George
Hansen, James V.
Hartnett, Thomas F.
Hefner, W. G.
Hendon, Bill
Hiler, John
Hillis, Elwood
Holland, Ken L.
Hollenbeck, Harold C.
Holt, Marjorie S.
Hopkins, Larry J.
Howard, James J.
Hubbard, Carroll, Jr.
Huckaby, Jerry
Hunter, Duncan
Hyde, Henry J.
Ireland, Andy
Jeffries, Jim
Jenkins, Ed
Johnston, Eugene
Jones, Walter B.
Kemp, Jack F.
Kindness, Thomas N.

Kogovsek, Ray
Kramer, Ken
Lagomarsino, Robert J.
Leath, Marvin
Lee, Gary A.
Lent, Norman F.
Lewis, Jerry
Loeffler, Thomas G.
Lott, Trent
Lowery, Bill
Lowry, Mike
Lujan, Manuel, Jr.
Luken, Thomas
Lugren, Dan
Marlenee, Ron
Marriott, Dan
Martin, David O'B.
Martin, James G.
Martin, Lynn
Mattox, Jim
McCloskey, Paul N.
McCollum, Bill
McCurdy, Dave
McDonald, Larry
McEwen, Bob
McGrath, Raymond J.
McHugh, Matthew F.
Miller, Clarence E.
Mitchell, Donald J.
Molinari, Guy V.
Mollohan, Robert H.
Montgomery, G. V. (Sonny)
Moorhead, Carlos J.
Morrison, Sid
Murphy, Austin J.
Myers, John T.
Napier, John L.
Neal, Stephen L.
Nichols, Bill
Oxley, Michael
Parris, Stan
Pashayan, Charles, Jr.
Petri, Thomas E.
Pritchard, Joel
Rahall, Nick Joe
Railsback, Tom
Ratchford, William R.
Richmond, Frederick W.
Rinaldo, Matthew J.
Ritter, Don
Roberts, Clint
Roberts, Pat
Robinson, J. Kenneth
Roemer, Buddy
Rogers, Harold
Rose, Charles
Roukema, Marge
Sabo, Martin Olav
Santini, Jim
Sawyer, Harold
Schneider, Claudine
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr.
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr.
Shelby, Richard C.
Shumway, Norman D.
Simon, Paul
Smith, Albert Lee, Jr.
Smith, Chris
Smith, Denny
Solomon, Gerald B.
Spence, Floyd
Staton, David Mick
Stenholm, Charles W.
Stump, Bob
Tauke, Thomas J.
Tauzin, W. J. (Billy)
Taylor, Gene
Trible, Paul S., Jr.
Walker, Robert S.
Wampler, William C.
Watkins, Wes
Weber, Ed
Weber, Vin
Whitley, Charles
Whittaker, Robert (Bob)
Whitten, Jamie L.
Williams, Lyle
Wilson, Charles
Winn, Larry, Jr.
Wolf, Frank R.
Wortley, George
Wyden, Ron
Wylie, Chalmers P.
Young, Don
Zeferetti, Leo C.●

TRADE WAR TOO STRONG? THINK ABOUT DIRTY TRADE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 28, 1982

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, when something unexpected and embarrassing happens in a crowded room, most people try to ignore it and go about what they are doing, and this seems to be the way some would have us handle the Atlantic and Pacific trade war of the 1980's.

Not one official review of the year past or projection of the year to come has touched on the economic hemorrhaging caused amoung our workers and industries by the predatory practices of our trading partners.

On social occasions, nobody is hurt and the source of the embarrassment quickly fades of its own accord.

But there will be no truce in this trade war—no reduction of casualties—unless the administration and the Congress do something to bring it about.

Workers and management across the United States are thinking about the situation and trying daily to deal with it, but they need more support than they are getting.

Although I believe that our partners are practicing trade war, the term might be too strong for others to consider at this point, and for that reason I offer the substitute of "dirty trade," which has been explored thoroughly by R. P. Simmons, president and chief executive officer of Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. The Company is located in Pittsburgh, part of ground zero in the trade war.

Mr. Simmons developed the term in a thoughtful article titled "The Art of Trading," which was published recently in Leaders magazine.

The smudge marks identifying dirty trade all are left by Government.

Dirty trade takes place because a government has decided to move goods as a matter of policy with the political goal of keeping home employment high. It has little to do with efficiency and technology and much to do with government ownership, government subsidy of exports and government investment.

Mr. Speaker, an argument can be made that the Japanese tax scheme on automobiles should be examined for the tell-tale smudge marks, according to information developed by the Chrysler Corp.

For example, $900 less is paid in taxes to the Japanese Government on one of their cars sold here than on one of their cars sold in Japan.

You see, they rebate that much on export, and the rebate comes off the sales price.

Meanwhile, the Japanese Government levies a $3,600 tax on a comparable American-made car going into Japan and subjects it to expensive rules and regulations.

Mr. Simmons thinks dirty trade mocks and distorts the theory of comparative advantage, which is supposed to be the guiding hand of free trade.

The United States should not be victimized by dirty trade, he said, and I agree strongly on that point.

Although I do not agree with Mr. Simmons on all points, his thoughtful exploration of the trade situation offers useful information and thought to any concerned Member of Congress, and for that reason I submit here the full text of "The Art of Trading":

The Art of Trading

(By R. P. Simmons)

International trade may be the priority issue of the 1980s. Trade has always been of vital importance to trading nations who must export to survive; the explosion in energy prices since 1973 has created additional incentive for nations to export to support their purchases of energy.

At the same time, a world economy—stagnant or growing slightly, at best—has created social and political instability as unemployment and inflation combine to reduce the real standard of living in most of the nations of the world. Nations that primarily export raw material commodities are faced with significant inflation in the cost of purchased energy while the prices of commodities they export have declined. High rates of population growth in underdeveloped countries place additional strains on governments faced not only with the need to industrialize but with the greater primary requirement to feed their populations.

BEGINNING TO RESTRICT

With few exceptions, every nation in the world is faced with a need to increase exports to support its energy habit. As a result, nations are beginning to adopt restrictive trade policies which tend to hinder imports while adopting incentives to increase exports.

The social and political strains caused by unemployment and inflation in Western European nations have resulted in increased direct government ownership and subsidization of major industries such as steel, coal, automobiles and electronics. The trend is clear and alarming. While observers have recognized the involvement by governments in the business sector in socialist countries of the world, the gradual increase in government involvement by western nations of the world has been less apparent. Even in Japan, where government involvement is more subtle and less direct, involvement in the private sector is a matter of policy used to promote the economic well-being of certain selected industrial sectors.

Less developed nations distort the concept of free trade under the guise of protecting infant industries through a series of actions which include closing borders to imports of products produced within those borders; the insistence that imported products contain a high maximum percentage of local content; of export requirements imposed as a prerequisite to foreign investment locally. Even in the United States, which historically has been the world's open market, calls for increased protection are being heard more frequently.

NEW BARRIERS, GREATER STRAINS

Traditionally, trade negotiations between countries have focused on the level of tariffs. However, non-tariff barriers are beginning to cause far greater strains because of their increased use. Furthermore, such barriers are more difficult to combat because of the complex nature and in many cases, less than formal manner, in which they are applied.

The concepts of free trade are well known. Comparative advantage, if permitted to function, will determine the nation in which any given product should be produced or manufactured. This assumes that there are no barriers to restrict the flow of trade between nations. Of course there have always been some trade barriers, tariff or nontariff, between nations. However, over the past 30 years, such barriers have gradually declined as nations have agreed to reduce tariffs on a multi-lateral basis as well as to reduce other non-tariff barriers.

This trend, however, appears to have been reversed sometime in the middle 1970s, caused in significant part by the rapid increase in the price of energy. Unless reversed, the trend toward increased protection will result in a gradually intensifying trade war in which all participants will be losers.

To examine potential solutions to this problem, one must first examine the nature of international trade. Products which are exported because they truly are produced more efficiently, more productively, at lower cost or provide a technology not available in the host country should be the kind of trade which moves from one nation to another with a minimum of restraint. There are exceptions for certain strategic industries vital to each nation's national defense. However, for the most part, the country most cost-effective should be the country of production.

DIRTY TRADE

A second category of trade is that which is exported to other nations, not because it is produced more effectively or offers technological advantage, but only because such trade has become an instrument of national policy. In effect, the dirty trade reflects the intent of one nation to beggar its neighbor by export unemployment to the receiving nation. The percentage of dirty trade compared to the total amount of world trade has increased as the pressures upon political institutions increase. Direct government ownership of industries which are significant exporters, direct government subsidies for privately owned companies which are exporters, direct government investment to expand productive capacity of companies which are primarily exporters fly in the face of economic logic, distort the theory of comparative advantage as well as use capital inefficiently in order to achieve noneconomic national objectives.

Increasingly, cries are being heard throughout the world that domestic industries must be protected. However, it is important that a clear distinction be made between clean trade and dirty trade to encourage nations to protect the efficient and the technologically advanced but not the inefficient and obsolete who cannot meet the test of comparative advantage. If it were possible to achieve this distinction, a significant lessening of economic strains which are currently on the rise among trading nations could be achieved.

Political institutions respond to economic and social pressures. The role that the private sector plays in each nation can have an immense impact on the policies that will be adopted by its government. Thus, the private sector should articulate the need to avoid dirty trade and concentrate instead on those products and industries in which each nation can be most efficient.

THE CEO'S ROLE

The role of chief executive in articulating this principle cannot be understated. His position provides a unique and visible platform from which to speak on the need for free trade in both directions. It is important that we articulate the issue that nations should neither be beggared by nor accused of beggaring other trading neighbors. Being the victor in the trade contest, if we can only be victor through government subsidization, must be avoided. Nor should we be victims of dirty trade.

We cannot expect to protect our home markets and expect to have free access to other foreign markets. The trading nations of the world must avoid significant trade distortions in a given trade sector. Failure to recognise this vital point will result in high political costs to the host nation. As businessmen, we must avoid asking for nontariff barriers if we are to expect access to other markets.

It must be recognized that the trade inequity caused by dirty trade is a zero sum game in which no one trading nation can gain in any transaction unless another suffers an equivalent loss. Only when comparative advantage is permitted to function can involved nations benefit. We must remember that world trade is neither all good nor all bad. Protectionism, when it becomes a matter of national policy, will invite significant retaliation.

Protectionism, however, is not all bad when it is in defense of efficient domestic companies who are disadvantaged by government subsidization of foreign competitors. These vital trade issues will grow increasingly important. We in the private sector must insure that our nations' governments choose the right course of action.

REVERSING THE TREND

Specific steps which can be taken immediately by business leaders to reverse the trend of protectionism are:

In developing nations, business leaders must resist further attempts by government and politicians to promote investments in enterprises which are not economically viable. Such investments result in less than zero sum benefits when all costs to the economy are accumulated.

In developing nations, business leaders must vigorously promote the concepts of comparative advantage urging governments to use capital efficiently concentrating on less capital-intensive investments.

In developed nations, business leaders should urge governments to resist political pressures to protect home markets from clean trade which results in increased economic costs to the economy.

Business leaders in all nations should speak out against government practices which close, completely, the borders to specific products. This practice, intended to nurture emerging industries, can be accomplished more effectively through the use of declining quotas to permit emerging companies to develop economies of scale.

Finally, to reverse the trend toward protectionism, business leaders have a responsibility to point out the inherent inefficiencies caused by protectionism and particularly the inefficiency of non-market economies. Business leaders have a major role to play in insuring that world trade is not a zero sum game.●

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SENATOR, STATE, AND CAPITOL OFFICE

(As furnished by the Office of the Sergeant at Arms.)

(NOTE.—Room numbers with 3 digits are in the Russell Senate Office Building, and 4 digits are in the Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.)

[Republicans in roman (53), Democrats in italic (46), Independent-Democrat* (1)]

	Suite No.
Vice Pres. Bush, George (Tex.)	2203
Abdnor, James (S. Dak.)	4327
Andrews, Mark (N. Dak)	417
Armstrong, William L. (Colo.)	1321
Baker, Howard H., Jr. (Tenn.)	4123
Baucus, Max (Mont.)	1107
Bentsen, Lloyd (Tex.)	240
Biden, Joseph R., Jr. (Del.)	456
Boren, David L. (Okla.)	440
Boschwitz, Rudy (Minn.)	2317
Bradley, Bill (N.J.)	2107
Bumpers, Dale (Ark.)	3229
Burdick, Quentin N. (N. Dak.)	451
**Byrd, Harry F., Jr.* (Va.)	245
Byrd, Robert C. (W. Va.)	133
Cannon, Howard W. (Nev.)	259
Chafee, John H. (R.I.)	5229
Chiles, Lawton (Fla.)	437
Cochran, Thad (Miss.)	321
Cohen, William S. (Maine)	1251
Cranston, Alan (Calif.)	229
D'Amato, Alfonse M. (N.Y.)	432
Danforth, John C. (Mo.)	460
DeConcini, Dennis (Ariz.)	3230
Denton, Jeremiah (Ala.)	5327
Dixon, Alan J. (Ill.)	4203
Dodd, Christopher J. (Conn.)	404
Dole, Robert (Kans.)	2213
Domenici, Pete V. (N. Mex.)	4239
Durenberger, David (Minn.)	353
Eagleton, Thomas F. (Mo.)	1209
East, John P. (N.C.)	5107
Exon, J. James (Nebr.)	3313
Ford, Wendell H. (Ky.)	363
Garn, Jake (Utah)	5207
Glenn, John (Ohio)	2235
Goldwater, Barry (Ariz.)	337
Gorton, Slade (Wash.)	3327
Grassley, Charles E. (Iowa)	232
Hart, Gary (Colo.)	221
Hatch, Orrin G. (Utah)	125
Hatfield, Mark O. (Oreg.)	463
Hawkins, Paula (Fla.)	1327
Hayakawa, S. I. (Sam), (Calif.)	6217
Heflin, Howell (Ala.)	3107
Heinz, John (Pa.)	443
Helms, Jesse (N.C.)	4213
Hollings, Ernest F. (S.C.)	115
Huddleston, Walter D. (Ky.)	2121
Humphrey, Gordon J. (N.H.)	6205
Inouye, Daniel K. (Hawaii)	105
Jackson, Henry M. (Wash.)	137
Jepsen, Roger W. (Iowa)	110
Johnston, J. Bennett (La.)	421
Kassebaum, Nancy Landon (Kans.)	304
Kasten, Bob (Wis.)	328
Kennedy, Edward M. (Mass.)	109
Laxalt, Paul (Nev.)	315
Leahy, Patrick J. (Vt.)	427
Levin, Carl (Mich.)	140
Long, Russell B. (La.)	217
Lugar, Richard G. (Ind.)	1113
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr. (Md.)	358
Matsunaga, Spark M. (Hawaii)	5121
Mattingly, Mack (Ga.)	6241
McClure, James A. (Idaho)	3121
Melcher, John (Mont.)	253
Metzenbaum, Howard M. (Ohio)	347
Mitchell, George J. (Maine)	344
Moynihan, Daniel Patrick (N.Y.)	442
Murkowski, Frank H. (Alaska)	2104
Nickles, Don (Okla.)	6327
Nunn, Sam (Ga.)	3241
Packwood, Bob (Oreg.)	145
Pell, Claiborne (R.I.)	325
Percy, Charles H. (Ill.)	4321
Pressler, Larry (S. Dak.)	411
Proxmire, William (Wis.)	5241
Pryor, David (Ark.)	248
Quayle, Dan (Ind.)	254
Randolph, Jennings (W. Va.)	3203
Riegle, Donald W., Jr. (Mich.)	1207
Roth, William V., Jr. (Del.)	3215
Rudman, Warren (N.H.)	4104
Sarbanes, Paul S. (Md.)	2327
Sasser, Jim (Tenn.)	260
Schmitt, Harrison "Jack" (N. Mex.)	5313
Simpson, Alan K. (Wyo.)	4107
Specter, Arlen (Pa.)	342
Stafford, Robert T. (Vt.)	5219
Stennis, John C. (Miss.)	205
Stevens, Ted (Alaska)	127
Symms, Steven D. (Idaho)	452
Thurmond, Strom (S.C.)	209
Tower, John (Tex.)	142
Tsongas, Paul E. (Mass.)	362
Wallop, Malcolm (Wyo.)	204
Warner, John W. (Va.)	405
Weicker, Lowell P., Jr. (Conn.)	313
Williams, Harrison A., Jr. (N.J.)	352
Zorinsky, Edward (Nebr.)	431

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Mr. Helms (chairman), Mr. Dole, Mr. Hayakawa, Mr. Lugar, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Boschwitz, Mr. Jepsen, Mrs. Hawkins, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Zorinsky, Mr. Melcher, Mr. Pryor, Mr. Boren, Mr. Dixon, and Mr. Heflin.

Committee on Appropriations

Mr. Hatfield (chairman), Mr. Stevens, Mr. Weicker, Mr. McClure, Mr. Laxalt, Mr. Garn, Mr. Schmitt, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Abdnor, Mr. Kasten, Mr. D'Amato, Mr. Mattingly, Mr. Rudman, Mr. Spector, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Chiles, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Sasser, Mr. DeConcini, and Mr. Bumpers.

Committee on Armed Services

Mr. Tower (chairman), Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Warner, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Jepsen, Mr. Quayle, Mr. Denton, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Nunn, Mr. Hart, Mr. Exon, and Mr. Levin.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Mr. Garn (chairman), Mr. Tower, Mr. Heinz, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Lugar, Mr. D'Amato, Mr. Chafee, Mr. Schmitt, Mr. Williams, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Dixon.

Committee on the Budget

Mr. Domenici (chairman), Mr. Armstrong, Mrs. Kassebaum, Mr. Boschwitz, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Tower, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Symms, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Kasten, Mr. Quayle, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Chiles, Mr. Biden, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Sasser, Mr. Hart, Mr. Metzenbaum, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Moynihan, and Mr. Exon.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Mr. Packwood (chairman), Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Schmitt, Mr. Danforth, Mrs. Kassebaum, Mr. Pressler, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Kasten, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Long, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Ford, Mr. Riegle, Mr. Exon, and Mr. Heflin.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

Mr. McClure (chairman), Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Wallop, Mr. Warner, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Nickles, Mr. East, Mr. Heinz, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Bumpers, Mr. Ford, Mr. Metzenbaum, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Melcher, Mr. Tsongas, and Mr. Bradley.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Mr. Stafford (chairman), Mr. Baker, Mr. Domenici, Mr. Chafee, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Abdnor, Mr. Symms, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Bentsen, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Hart, Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Baucus.

Committee on Finance

Mr. Dole (chairman), Mr. Packwood, Mr. Roth, Mr. Danforth, Mr. Chafee, Mr. Heinz, Mr. Wallop, Mr. Durenberger, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Symms, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Long, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Bentsen, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Boren, Mr. Bradley, and Mr. Mitchell.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Mr. Percy (chairman), Mr. Baker, Mr. Helms, Mr. Hayakawa, Mr. Lugar, Mr. Mathias, Mrs. Kassebaum, Mr. Boschwitz, Mr. Pressler, Mr. Pell, Mr. Biden, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Sarbanes, Mr. Zorinsky, Mr. Tsongas, Mr. Cranston, and Mr. Dodd.

Committee on Governmental Affairs

Mr. Roth (chairman), Mr. Percy, Mr. Stevens, Mr. Mathias, Mr. Danforth, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Durenberger, Mr. Mattingly, Mr. Rudman, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Chiles, Mr. Nunn, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Sasser, Mr. Pryor, and Mr. Levin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Mr. Thurmond (chairman), Mr. Mathias, Mr. Laxalt, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Dole, Mr. Simpson, Mr. East, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Denton, Mr. Specter, Mr. Biden, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Metzenbaum, Mr. DeConcini, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Baucus, and Mr. Heflin.

Committee on Labor and Human Resources

Mr. Hatch (chairman), Mr. Stafford, Mr. Quayle, Mrs. Hawkins, Mr. Nickles, Mr. Weicker, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Denton, Mr. East, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pell, Mr. Eagleton, Mr. Riegle, and Mr. Metzenbaum.

Committee on Small Business

Mr. Weicker (chairman), Mr. Packwood, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Hayakawa, Mr. Boschwitz, Mr. Gorton, Mr. Nickles, Mr. Rudman, Mr. D'Amato, Mr. Nunn, Mr. Huddleston, Mr. Bumpers, Mr. Sasser, Mr. Baucus, Mr. Levin, Mr. Tsongas, and Mr. Dixon.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Mr. Mathias (chairman), Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Baker, Mr. McClure, Mr. Helms, Mr. Warner, Mr. Dole, Mr. Ford, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Pell, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, and Mr. Williams.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Mr. Simpson (chairman), Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Stafford, Mr. Kasten, Mr. Denton, Mr. Murkowski, Mr. Specter, Mr. Cranston, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. DeConcini, and Mr. Mitchell.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

President Pro Tempore—Strom Thurmond.
Secretary of the Senate—William F. Hildenbrand.
Sergeant at Arms of the Senate—Howard S. Liebengood.
Secretary for the Majority—Howard O. Greene, Jr.
Secretary for the Minority—Terrence E. Sauvain.
Chaplain of the Senate—Reverend Richard C. Halverson, L.L.D., D.D.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Chief Justice Burger, of Virginia.
Justice Brennan, of New Jersey.
Justice White, of Colorado.
Justice Marshall, of New York.
Justice Blackmun, of Minnesota.
Justice Powell, of Virginia.
Justice Rehnquist, of Arizona.
Justice Stevens, of Illinois.
Justice O'Connor, of Arizona.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Alexander L. Stevas.
Librarian—Roger F. Jacobs.
Marshal—Alfred Wong.
Reporter of Decisions—Henry C. Lind.
Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice—Mark W. Cannon.

Public Information Officer—Barrett McGurn.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Chief Justice Burger.

First judicial circuit: Justice Brennan. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Justice Marshall. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Chief Justice Burger. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Justice White. Canal Zone, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Justice O'Connor. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Justice Stevens. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Justice Blackmun. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Justice Rehnquist. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Eleventh judicial circuit: Justice Powell. Alabama, Florida, Georgia.

REPRESENTATIVE, STATE, AND CAPITOL OFFICE

(As furnished by the Clerk of the House.)

(NOTE.—Room numbers with 3 digits are in the Cannon House Office Building, 4 digits beginning with 1 are in the Longworth House Office Building, and 4 digits beginning with 2 are in the Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.)

[Democrats in roman (243), Republicans in italics (192), total 435.]

	Office No.
Addabbo, Joseph P. (N.Y.)	2256
Akaka, Daniel K. (Hawaii)	1510
Albosta, Donald Joseph (Mich.)	1318
Alexander, Bill (Ark.)	201
Anderson, Glenn M. (Calif.)	2329
Andrews, Ike (N.C.)	2201
Annunzio, Frank (Ill.)	2303
Anthony, Beryl, Jr. (Ark.)	213
Applegate, Douglas (Ohio)	435
Archer, Bill (Tex.)	1135
Ashbrook, John M. (Ohio)	1436
Aspin, Les (Wis.)	442
Atkinson, Eugene V. (Pa.)	412
AuCoin, Les (Oreg.)	2446
Badham, Robert E. (Calif.)	1108
Bafalis, L. A. (*Skip*) (Fla.)	2433
Bailey, Don (Pa.)	116
Bailey, Wendell (Mo.)	504
Barnard, Doug, Jr. (Ga.)	236
Barnes, Michael D. (Md.)	401
Beard, Robin L. (Tenn.)	229
Bedell, Berkley (Iowa)	2440
Beilenson, Anthony C. (Calif.)	1025
Benedict, Cleve (W. Va.)	1229
Benjamin, Adam, Jr. (Ind.)	410
Bennett, Charles E. (Fla.)	2107
Bereuter, Douglas K. (Nebr.)	1314
Bethune, Ed (Ark.)	1535
Bevill, Tom (Ala.)	2302
Biaggi, Mario (N.Y.)	2428
Bingham, Jonathan B. (N.Y.)	2262
Blanchard, James J. (Mich.)	2453
Bliley, Thomas J., Jr. (Va.)	214
Boggs, Lindy (Mrs. Hale) (La.)	2353
Boland, Edward P. (Mass.)	2426
Bolling, Richard (Mo.)	2365
Boner, William Hill (Tenn.)	118
Bonior, David E. (Mich.)	1130
Bonker, Don (Wash.)	434
Bouquard, Marilyn Lloyd (Tenn.)	2334
Bowen, David R. (Miss.)	2421
Breaux, John B. (La.)	2159
Brinkley, Jack (Ga.)	2470
Brodhead, William M. (Mich.)	1114
Brooks, Jack (Tex.)	2449
Broomfield, Wm. S. (Mich.)	2306
Brown, Clarence J. (Ohio)	2217
Brown, George E., Jr. (Calif.)	2342
Brown, Hank (Colo.)	1319
Broyhill, James T. (N.C.)	2340
Burgener, Clair W. (Calif.)	343
Burton, John L. (Calif.)	1714
Burton, Phillip (Calif.)	2304
Butler, M. Caldwell (Va.)	2330
Byron, Beverly B. (Md.)	1216
Campbell, Carroll A., Jr. (S.C.)	408
Carman, Gregory W. (N.Y.)	1729
Carney, William (N.Y.)	1113
Chappell, Bill, Jr. (Fla.)	2468
Chappie, Gene (Calif.)	1730
Cheney, Dick (Wyo.)	225
Chisholm, Shirley (N.Y.)	2182
Clausen, Don H. (Calif.)	2308
Clay, William (Bill) (Mo.)	2264
Clinger, William F., Jr. (Pa.)	1221
Coats, Dan (Ind.)	1427
Coelho, Tony (Calif.)	216
Coleman, E. Thomas (Mo.)	1527
Collins, Cardiss (Ill.)	2438
Collins, James M. (Tex.)	2419
Conable, Barber B., Jr. (N.Y.)	237
Conte, Silvio O. (Mass.)	2300
Conyers, John, Jr. (Mich.)	2313
Corcoran, Tom (Ill.)	1107
Corrada, Baltasar[1] (P.R.)	1410
Coughlin, Lawrence (Pa.)	2467
Courter, James A. (N.J.)	325
Coyne, James K. (Pa.)	119
Coyne, William J. (Pa.)	511
Craig, Larry E. (Idaho)	515
Crane, Daniel B. (Ill.)	115
Crane, Philip M. (Ill.)	1035
Crockett, George W., Jr. (Mich.)	1531
D'Amours, Norman E. (N.H.)	2242
Daniel, Dan (Va.)	2368
Daniel, Robert W., Jr. (Va.)	2236
Danielson, George E. (Calif.)	2265
Dannemeyer, William E. (Calif.)	1032
Daschle, Thomas A. (S. Dak.)	439
Daub, Hal (Nebr.)	1008
Davis, Robert W. (Mich.)	1224
Deckard, Joel (Ind.)	125
de la Garza, E (Tex.)	1434
Dellums, Ronald V. (Calif.)	2136
de Lugo, Ron[2] (V.I.)	2443
DeNardis, Lawrence J. (Conn.)	1429
Derrick, Butler (S.C.)	133
Derwinski, Edward J. (Ill.)	1401
Dickinson, William L. (Ala.)	2406
Dicks, Norman D. (Wash.)	1122
Dingell, John D. (Mich.)	2221
Dixon, Julian C. (Calif.)	423
Donnelly, Brian J. (Mass.)	1019
Dorgan, Byron L. (N. Dak.)	427
Dornan, Robert K. (Calif.)	332
Dougherty, Charles F. (Pa.)	422
Dowdy, Wayne (Miss.)	1631
Downey, Thomas J. (N.Y.)	303
Dreier, David (Calif.)	1641
Duncan, John J. (Tenn.)	2458
Dunn, Jim (Mich.)	1511
Dwyer, Bernard J. (N.J.)	437
Dymally, Mervyn M. (Calif.)	1116
Dyson, Roy (Md.)	1020
Early, Joseph D. (Mass.)	2349
Eckart, Dennis E. (Ohio)	1222
Edgar, Bob (Pa.)	2442
Edwards, Don (Calif.)	2307
Edwards, Jack (Ala.)	2369
Edwards, Mickey (Okla.)	208
Emerson, Bill (Mo.)	418
Emery, David F. (Maine)	2437
English, Glenn (Okla.)	104
Erdahl, Arlen (Minn.)	1518
Erlenborn, John N. (Ill.)	2206
Ertel, Allen E. (Pa.)	1211
Evans, Billy Lee (Ga.)	113
Evans, Cooper (Iowa)	317
Evans, David W. (Ind.)	438
Evans, Thomas B., Jr. (Del.)	316
Fary, John G. (Ill.)	1121
Fascell, Dante B. (Fla.)	2354
Fauntroy, Walter E.[3] (D.C.)	2350
Fazio, Vic (Calif.)	1421
Fenwick, Millicent (N.J.)	1230
Ferraro, Geraldine A. (N.Y.)	312
Fiedler, Bobbi (Calif.)	1607
Fields, Jack (Tex.)	510
Findley, Paul (Ill.)	2113
Fish, Hamilton, Jr. (N.Y.)	2227
Fithian, Floyd J. (Ind.)	1210
Flippo, Ronnie G. (Ala.)	405
Florio, James J. (N.J.)	1740
Foglietta, Thomas M. (Pa.)	1217
Foley, Thomas S. (Wash.)	1201
Ford, Harold E. (Tenn.)	2445
Ford, William D. (Mich.)	239
Forsythe, Edwin B. (N.J.)	2210
Fountain, L. H. (N.C.)	2188
Fowler, Wyche, Jr. (Ga.)	1504
Frank, Barney (Mass.)	1609
Frenzel, Bill (Minn.)	1026
Frost, Martin (Tex.)	1238
Fuqua, Don (Fla.)	2269
Garcia, Robert (N.Y.)	223
Gaydos, Joseph M. (Pa.)	2366
Gejdenson, Sam (Conn.)	1503
Gephardt, Richard A. (Mo.)	218
Gibbons, Sam (Fla.)	2204
Gilman, Benjamin A. (N.Y.)	2160
Gingrich, Newt (Ga.)	1005
Ginn, Bo (Ga.)	2135
Glickman, Dan (Kans.)	1507
Goldwater, Barry M., Jr. (Calif.)	2240
Gonzalez, Henry B. (Tex.)	2252
Goodling, William F. (Pa.)	109
Gore, Albert, Jr. (Tenn.)	1131
Gradison, Willis D., Jr. (Ohio)	1117
Gramm, Phil (Tex.)	1721
Gray, William H., III (Pa.)	429
Green, Bill (N.Y.)	1417
Gregg, Judd (N.H.)	503
Grisham, Wayne (Calif.)	120
Guarini, Frank J. (N.J.)	1530
Gunderson, Steve (Wis.)	416
Hagedorn, Tom (Minn.)	2344
Hall, Ralph M. (Tex.)	1223
Hall, Sam B., Jr. (Tex.)	318
Hall, Tony P. (Ohio)	1728
Hamilton, Lee H. (Ind.)	2187
Hammerschmidt, John Paul (Ark.)	2207
Hance, Kent (Tex.)	1039
Hansen, George (Idaho)	1125
Hansen, James V. (Utah)	1407
Harkin, Tom (Iowa)	2411
Hartnett, Thomas F. (S.C.)	509
Hatcher, Charles (Ga.)	1726
Hawkins, Augustus F. (Calif.)	2371
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mass.)	2312
Hefner, W. G. (Bill) (N.C.)	2161
Heftel, Cecil (Cec) (Hawaii)	1030
Hendon, Bill (N.C.)	212
Hertel, Dennis M. (Mich.)	1017
Hightower, Jack (Tex.)	2348
Hiler, John (Ind.)	1338
Hillis, Elwood (Ind.)	2336
Holland, Ken (S.C.)	2431
Hollenbeck, Harold C. (N.J.)	1526
Holt, Marjorie S. (Md.)	2412
Hopkins, Larry J. (Ky.)	331
Horton, Frank (N.Y.)	2229
Howard, James J. (N.J.)	2245
Hoyer, Steny H. (Md.)	1513
Hubbard, Carroll, Jr. (Ky.)	2244
Huckaby, Jerry (La.)	228
Hughes, William J. (N.J.)	436
Hunter, Duncan (Calif.)	415
Hutto, Earl (Fla.)	330
Hyde, Henry J. (Ill.)	1203
Ireland, Andy (Fla.)	1124
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr. (Ind.)	1533
Jeffords, James M. (Vt.)	1524
Jeffries, Jim (Kans.)	424
Jenkins, Ed (Ga.)	217
Johnston, Eugene (N.C.)	128
Jones, Ed (Tenn.)	108
Jones, James R. (Okla.)	203
Jones, Walter B. (N.C.)	241
Kastenmeier, Robert W. (Wis.)	2232
Kazen, Abraham, Jr. (Tex.)	2408
Kemp, Jack F. (N.Y.)	2235
Kennelly, Barbara B. (Conn.)	1630
Kildee, Dale E. (Mich.)	314
Kindness, Thomas N. (Ohio)	2434
Kogovsek, Ray (Colo.)	430
Kramer, Ken (Colo.)	114
LaFalce, John J. (N.Y.)	2447
Lagomarsino, Robert J. (Calif.)	2332
Lantos, Tom (Calif.)	1123
Latta, Delbert L. (Ohio)	2309
Leach, Jim (Iowa)	1514
Leath, Marvin (Tex.)	336
LeBoutillier, John (N.Y.)	417
Lee, Gary A. (N.Y.)	322
Lehman, William (Fla.)	2347
Leland, Mickey (Tex.)	419
Lent, Norman F. (N.Y.)	2228
Levitas, Elliott H. (Ga.)	2416
Lewis, Jerry (Calif.)	327
Livingston, Bob (La.)	206
Loeffler, Tom (Tex.)	1212
Long, Clarence D. (Md.)	2405
Long, Gillis W. (La.)	2311
Lott, Trent (Miss.)	2400
Lowery, Bill (Calif.)	1331
Lowry, Mike (Wash.)	1206
Lujan, Manuel, Jr. (N. Mex.)	1323

---

[1] Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

[2] Delegate from the Virgin Islands.

[3] Delegate from the District of Columbia.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

	Office No.
Luken, Thomas A. (Ohio)	240
Lundine, Stanley N. (N.Y.)	231
Lungren, Dan (Calif.)	328
McClory, Robert (Ill.)	2109
McCloskey, Paul N., Jr. (Calif.)	205
McCollum, Bill (Fla.)	1313
McCurdy, Dave (Okla.)	313
McDade, Joseph M. (Pa.)	2370
McDonald, Larry (Ga.)	103
McEwen, Bob (Ohio)	507
McGrath, Raymond J. (N.Y.)	506
McHugh, Matthew F. (N.Y.)	306
McKinney, Stewart B. (Conn.)	106
Madigan, Edward R. (Ill.)	2457
Markey, Edward J. (Mass.)	403
Marks, Marc L. (Pa.)	1424
Marlenee, Ron (Mont.)	409
Marriott, Dan (Utah)	1133
Martin, David O'B. (N.Y.)	502
Martin, James G. (N.C.)	341
Martin, Lynn (Ill.)	1208
Matsui, Robert T. (Calif.)	329
Mattox, Jim (Tex.)	1111
Mavroules, Nicholas (Mass.)	1204
Mazzoli, Romano L. (Ky.)	2246
Mica, Dan (Fla.)	131
Michel, Robert H. (Ill.)	2112
Mikulski, Barbara A. (Md.)	407
Miller, Clarence E. (Ohio)	2208
Miller, George (Calif.)	2422
Mineta, Norman Y. (Calif.)	2352
Minish, Joseph G. (N.J.)	2162
Mitchell, Donald J. (N.Y.)	2305
Mitchell, Parren J. (Md.)	2367
Moakley, Joe (Mass.)	221
Moffett, Anthony Toby (Conn.)	127
Molinari, Guy V. (N.Y.)	501
Mollohan, Robert H. (W. Va.)	339
Montgomery, G. V. (Sonny) (Miss.)	2184
Moore, W. Henson (La.)	2404
Moorhead, Carlos J. (Calif.)	2346
Morrison, Sid (Wash.)	1330
Mottl, Ronald M. (Ohio)	2459
Murphy, Austin J. (Pa.)	204
Murtha, John P. (Pa.)	2423
Myers, John T. (Ind.)	2301
Napier, John L. (S.C.)	238
Natcher, William H. (Ky.)	2333
Neal, Stephen L. (N.C.)	2463
Nelligan, James L. (Pa.)	1711
Nelson, Bill (Fla.)	307
Nichols, Bill (Ala.)	2417
Nowak, Henry J. (N.Y.)	2430
Oakar, Mary Rose (Ohio)	107
Oberstar, James L. (Minn.)	2351
Obey, David R. (Wis.)	2230
O'Brien, George M. (Ill.)	2439
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr. (Mass.)	2231
Ottinger, Richard L. (N.Y.)	2241
Oxley, Michael G. (Ohio)	1724
Panetta, Leon E. (Calif.)	431
Parris, Stan (Va.)	428
Pashayan, Charles, Jr. (Calif.)	129
Patman, Bill (Tex.)	1408
Patterson, Jerry M. (Calif.)	2238
Paul, Ron (Tex.)	1234
Pease, Donald J. (Ohio)	1127
Pepper, Claude (Fla.)	2239
Perkins, Carl D. (Ky.)	2328
Petri, Thomas E. (Wis.)	1024
Peyser, Peter A. (N.Y.)	301
Pickle, J. J. (Tex.)	242
Porter, John Edward (Ill.)	1529
Price, Melvin (Ill.)	2110
Pritchard, Joel (Wash.)	2268
Pursell, Carl D. (Mich.)	1414
Quillen, James H. (Jimmy) (Tenn.)	102
Rahall, Nick Joe, II (W. Va.)	440
Railsback, Tom (Ill.)	2104
Rangel, Charles B. (N.Y.)	2432
Ratchford, William R. (Conn.)	432
Regula, Ralph (Ohio)	2209
Reuss, Henry S. (Wis.)	2413
Rhodes, John J. (Ariz.)	2310
Richmond, Frederick W. (N.Y.)	1707
Rinaldo, Matthew J. (N.J.)	2338
Ritter, Don (Pa.)	124
Roberts, Clint (S. Dak.)	1009
Roberts, Pat (Kans.)	1428
Robinson, J. Kenneth (Va.)	2233
Rodino, Peter W., Jr. (N.J.)	2462
Roe, Robert A., (N.J.)	2243
Roemer, Buddy (La.)	1725
Rogers, Harold (Ky.)	413
Rose, Charles (N.C.)	2435
Rosenthal, Benjamin S. (N.Y.)	2372
Rostenkowski, Dan (Ill.)	2111
Roth, Toby (Wis.)	215
Roukema, Marge (N.J.)	226
Rousselot, John H. (Calif.)	2133
Roybal, Edward R. (Calif.)	2211
Rudd, Eldon (Ariz.)	1110
Russo, Marty (Ill.)	2464
Sabo, Martin Olav (Minn.)	426
St Germain, Fernand J. (R.I.)	2108
Santini, Jim (Nev.)	2429
Savage, Gus (Ill.)	1233
Sawyer, Harold S. (Mich.)	123
Scheuer, James H. (N.Y.)	2402
Schneider, Claudine (R.I.)	1431
Schroeder, Patricia (Colo.)	2410
Schulze, Richard T. (Pa.)	2444
Schumer, Charles E. (N.Y.)	126
Seiberling, John F. (Ohio)	1225
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr. (Wis.)	315
Shamansky, Bob (Ohio)	308
Shannon, James M. (Mass.)	224
Sharp, Philip R. (Ind.)	2452
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr. (Fla.)	1213
Shelby, Richard C. (Ala.)	1705
Shumway, Norman D. (Calif.)	1228
Shuster, Bud (Pa.)	2455
Siljander, Mark D. (Mich.)	1022
Simon, Paul (Ill.)	227
Skeen, Joe (N. Mex.)	1508
Skelton, Ike (Mo.)	1404
Smith, Albert Lee, Jr. (Ala.)	1406
Smith, Christopher H. (N.J.)	513
Smith, Denny (Oreg.)	1207
Smith, Joseph F. (Pa.)	1723
Smith, Neal (Iowa)	2373
Smith, Virginia (Nebr.)	2202
Snowe, Olympia J. (Maine)	130
Snyder, Gene (Ky.)	2185
Solarz, Stephen J. (N.Y.)	1536
Solomon, Gerald B. H. (N.Y.)	323
Spence, Floyd (S.C.)	2427
Stangeland, Arlan (Minn.)	1519
Stanton, J. William (Ohio)	2466
Stark, Fortney H. (Pete) (Calif.)	1034
Staton, David Michael (W. Va.)	425
Stenholm, Charles W. (Tex.)	1232
Stokes, Louis (Ohio)	2465
Stratton, Samuel S. (N.Y.)	2205
Studds, Gerry E. (Mass.)	1501
Stump, Bob (Ariz.)	211
Sunia, Fofó I. F.[1] (Am. Samoa)	1709
Swift, Al (Wash.)	1502
Synar, Mike (Okla.)	1713
Tauke, Thomas J. (Iowa)	319
Tauzin, W. J. (Billy) (La.)	222
Taylor, Gene (Mo.)	2134
Thomas, William M. (Calif.)	324
Traxler, Bob (Mich.)	2448
Trible, Paul S., Jr. (Va.)	326
Udall, Morris K. (Ariz.)	235
Vander Jagt, Guy (Mich.)	2409
Vento, Bruce F. (Minn.)	230
Volkmer, Harold L. (Mo.)	1007
Walgren, Doug (Pa.)	117
Walker, Robert S. (Pa.)	1028
Wampler, William C. (Va.)	2407
Washington, Harold (Ill.)	1610
Watkins, Wes (Okla.)	137
Waxman, Henry A. (Calif.)	2418
Weaver, James (Oreg.)	1226
Weber, Ed (Ohio)	512
Weber, Vin (Minn.)	514
Weiss, Ted (N.Y.)	132
White, Richard C. (Tex.)	2186
Whitehurst, G. William (Va.)	2469
Whitley, Charles (N.C.)	404
Whittaker, Bob (Kans.)	516
Whitten, Jamie L. (Miss.)	2314
Williams, Lyle (Ohio)	1004
Williams, Pat (Mont.)	1512
Wilson, Charles (Tex.)	1214
Winn, Larry, Jr. (Kans.)	2268
Wirth, Timothy E. (Colo.)	2454
Wolf, Frank R. (Va.)	414
Wolpe, Howard (Mich.)	1118
Won Pat, Antonio Borja[1] (Guam)	2441
Wortley, George C. (N.Y.)	508
Wright, Jim (Tex.)	1236
Wyden, Ron (Oreg.)	1440
Wylie, Chalmers P. (Ohio)	2335
Yates, Sidney R. (Ill.)	2234
Yatron, Gus (Pa.)	2267
Young, C. W. Bill (Fla.)	2266
Young, Don (Alaska)	2331
Young, Robert A. (Mo.)	1317
Zablocki, Clement J. (Wis.)	2183
Zeferetti, Leo C. (N.Y.)	2436

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Speaker—Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
Clerk—Edmund L. Henshaw, Jr.
Sergeant at Arms—Benjamin J. Guthrie.
Doorkeeper—James T. Molloy.
Postmaster—Robert V. Rota.
Chaplain—James David Ford.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

G. Russell Walker, Editor in Chief

Official Reporters

William D. Mohr — E. Frances Garro
Benjamin H. Firshein — Frank A. Smonskey
C. J. Reynolds — Ronald Kavulick
Jerald D. Linnell

John M. Lacovara, Morning Business Clerk
Jeanie Bowles, Assistant Editor
Terry Rainey, Staff Assistant

L. H. (Jim) Timberlake, Editor, Senate Daily Digest.
Thom G. Pellikaan, Assistant Editor, Senate Daily Digest.

HOUSE

Geraldine C. Lyda, Director.
Robert B. Thomas, Deputy Director.
Edward White, Lead Clerk.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Representative Reuss (chairman), Senator Jepsen (vice chairman), Representative Bolling, Representative Hamilton, Representative Long of Louisiana, Representative Mitchell of Maryland, Representative Richmond, Representative Brown of Ohio, Representative Heckler, Representative Rousselot, Representative Wylie, Senator Roth, Senator Abdnor, Senator Symms, Senator Hawkins, Senator Mattingly, Senator Bentsen, Senator Proxmire, Senator Kennedy, and Senator Sarbanes.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Representative Hawkins (chairman), Senator Mathias (vice chairman), Representative Swift, Representative William J. Coyne, Representative Gingrich, Representative James K. Coyne, Senator Hatfield, Senator Baker, Senator Pell, and Senator Williams.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Senator Mathias (chairman), Representative Hawkins (vice chairman), Senator Warner, Senator Hatfield, Senator Cannon, Senator Ford, Representative Gaydos, Representative Jones of Tennessee, Representative Gingrich, and Representative Martin of Illinois.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Representative Rostenkowski (chairman), Senator Dole (vice chairman), Representative Gibbons, Representative Pickle, Representative Conable, Representative Duncan, Senator Packwood, Senator Roth, Senator Long, and Senator Byrd of Virginia.

---

[1] Delegate from American Samoa.

[1] Delegate from Guam.

Thursday, January 28, 1982

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate and House held a joint meeting in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S71–S164

Bills Introduced: Fifteen bills and twenty resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2018–2132, S.J. Res. 139–141, S. Con. Res. 59–60, and S. Res. 285–299. **Pages S93–S94**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. Res. 289, requesting $1,237,000 in operating expenses of the Committee on Rules and Administration (S. Rept. No. 97–308).

S. Res. 290, authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the "Senate Election Law Guidebook" as a Senate document (S. Rept. No. 97–309).

S. Res. 295, requesting $2,439,912 in operating expenses of the Committee on Foreign Relations (S. Rept. No. 97–310). Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 258, waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act with respect to the consideration of S. 1662, establishing a Federal program for the interim storage and permanent disposal of high-level nuclear waste from civilian powerplants.

S. Res. 259, waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act with respect to the consideration of S. 1906, providing for grade limitations for flag and general officers.

S. Res. 286, requesting $2,132,840 in operating expenses of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 287, requesting $2,267,000 in operating expenses of the Committee on Environment and Public Works. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 288, requesting $3,171,746 in operating expenses of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 291, requesting $2,143,200 in operating expenses of the Committee on Finance. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 292, requesting $3,785,310 in operating expenses of the Committee on Appropriations. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 293, requesting $2,685,961 in operating expenses of the Committee on the Budget. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 294, requesting $902,000 in operating expenses of the Committee on Small Business. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. Res. 296, requesting $4,672,526 in operating expenses of the Committee on Governmental Affairs. Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S.J. Res. 139, permitting the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland." **Pages S92–S93**

Measures Passed:

Study Group on Commemoration of U.S. Senate Bicentenary: Senate agreed to S. Res. 285, extending the reporting date of the Study Group on the Commemoration of the United States Senate Bicentenary to not later than December 31, 1982. **Page S73**

Authorizing Broadcast of Film on Poland: Senate passed H.J. Res. 382, permitting the broadcasting in the United States of the International Communication Agency film "Let Poland Be Poland: A Day of Solidarity With the People of Poland." **Page S164**

Treaty Received: The injunction of secrecy was removed from a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Spain, signed in Brussels on December 10, 1981 on behalf of the United States and the other parties to the North Atlantic Treaty

(Treaty Doc. No. 97-22), which was received in the Senate on January 26, was considered as having been read the first time, and referred with accompanying papers to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

Pages S163-S164

Nominations: Senate received the following nominations:

Fred J. Eckert, of New York, to be Ambassador to Fiji, and to serve concurrently as Ambassador to the Republic of Kiribati, Ambassador to the Kingdom of Tonga, and Ambassador to Tuvalu.

Robert B. Krupansky, of Ohio, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

James L. George, of Maryland, and Norman Terrell, of California, each to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

30 Army nominations in the rank of General.

45 Navy nominations in the rank of Admiral.

82 Air Force nominations in the rank of General.

4 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of Admiral.

Routine lists of nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Pages S164-S207

Presidential Message: On January 26, during the recess, Senate received a message from the President on the state of the Union, which was ordered to lie on the table (PM-105).

Pages S84-S88

Joint Meeting—F. D. R. Anniversary: Senate held a joint meeting with the House of Representatives in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

(See House proceedings)

Messages From the President:	**Page S84**
Messages From the House:	**Page S88**
Communications:	**Pages S88-S90**
Statements on Introduced Bills:	**Pages S94-S107**
Notices of Hearings:	**Page S117**
Additional Statements:	**Pages S117-S163**
Nominations:	**Pages S164-S207**

Recess: Senate convened at 10 a.m., and recessed at 10:41 a.m., until 11 a.m., on Friday, January 29, 1982. (For Senate's program see remarks of Senator Baker in today's Record on pages S163-S164.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

COMMITTEE BUDGET

Committee on Appropriations: Committee approved for reporting an original resolution (S. Res. 292) requesting $3,785,310 in operating expenses of the committee for 1982.

COMMITTEE BUDGET/BUDGET WAIVERS

Committee on the Budget: Committee approved for reporting the following original resolutions:

S. Res. 293, requesting $2,685,961 in operating expenses of the committee for 1982;

S. Res. 259, waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act with respect to consideration of S. 1906, providing for grade limitations for flag and general officers; and

S. Res. 258, waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act with respect to consideration of S. 1662, establishing a Federal program for the interim storage and permanent disposal of high-level nuclear waste from civilian powerplants.

MINERAL ROYALTIES

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee held oversight hearings on methods of collecting, accounting, and distributing mineral royalties, and to review the report of the Commission on Fiscal Accountability of the Nation's Energy Resources on management of Federal oil royalties, receiving testimony from James G. Watt, Secretary, and Dallas Peck, Director, U.S. Geological Survey, both of the Department of the Interior; David F. Linoews, Chairman, Commission on Fiscal Accountability of the Nation's Energy Resources; James Griffith and Randy Fetterolf, both of the Office of Wyoming State Auditor, Cheyenne; and John Butler, Charles Lohah, and David Harrison, all of the Council of Energy Resource Tribes, Washington, D.C.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

AIRBAGS IN AUTOS

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Taxation and Debt Management concluded hearings on S. 1887, imposing a tax on the sale of certain automobiles sold without automatic safety airbags, and allowing a tax credit to manufacturers of automobiles equipped with such airbags, after receiving testimony from William Haddon, Jr., Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Clarence Ditlow, Center for Auto Safety, and Joan Claybrook, former Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, all of Washington, D.C.; Lowell Beck, National Association of Independent Insurers, Chicago, Illinois; Robert F. McDermott, United Services Automobile Association, San Antonio, Texas; Douglass M. Fergusson, Nationwide Insurance Companies, Columbus, Ohio; Stephen Teret, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, on behalf of the American Public Health Association; and Roger Maugh, Ford Motor Company, Detroit, Michigan.

COMMITTEE BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported an original resolution (S. Res. 295) requesting $2,439,912 in operating expenses of the committee for 1982, and a Foreign Service officers list dated December 15, 1981.

CHINA/TAIWAN—U.S. RELATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee met in closed session to discuss U.S. relations with China and Taiwan, receiving testimony from John H. Holdridge, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

Committee recessed subject to call.

GUATEMALA/EL SALVADOR

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs met in closed session to discuss the military situation in Guatemala and El Salvador, receiving testimony from officials of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

VOTING RIGHTS EXTENSION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on the Constitution continued hearings on S. 53, S. 1761, S. 1975, and S. 1992, bills extending the effects of certain provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, receiving testimony from Senator Cochran; Representatives Hyde, and Bliley; Barry Gross, City College of the City University, New York City; Mayor Henry Marsh, Richmond, Virginia; Edward Erler, National Humanities Center, Raleigh, North Carolina; and Laughlin McDonald, A.C.L.U., Atlanta, Georgia.

Hearings continue on Monday, February 1.

JUVENILES AND DANGEROUS DRUGS/ CAREER CRIMINALS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice resumed hearings on S. 1688, making it a Federal offense when a convicted criminal commits a series of crimes involving firearms, and held oversight hearings on the use of certain drugs by juveniles, receiving testimony from Jack Durrell, Deputy Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Department of Health and Human Services; Thomas W. Paukin, Director, and Connie Horner, Deputy Assistant Director of Policy and Planning, both of ACTION; John Milligan, Circuit Judge, Fifth Circuit of Ohio, representing the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges; Abe Pollin, Washington, D.C.; Janet Reno, Dade County, Florida; Penny Grodenchik, Gaudenzia, Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Sidney Shankman, Second Genesis, Alexandria, Virginia.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 15 public bills, H.R. 5383–5397; 1 private bill, H.R. 5398; and 12 resolutions, H.J. Res. 388, H. Con. Res. 252–257, and H. Res. 328–332 were introduced.

Page H129

Recess: House recessed at 10:02 a.m. for a joint meeting with the Senate in commemoration of the centennial of the birth of Franklin Delano Roosevelt; and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Page H81

Extradition of Ziad Abu Eain: House agreed to table H. Res. 300, directing the Secretary of State to provide to the House of Representatives certain information concerning the pending extradition proceedings against Ziad Abu Eain.

Pages H102–H107

Day of Solidarity With Poland: House agreed to H. Res. 328, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that January 30, 1982, should be observed as a national day of solidarity with the people of Poland.

Page H107

Legislative Program: Acting Majority Leader announced the legislative program for the week of February 1. Agreed to adjourn from Friday, January 29, to Tuesday, February 2.

Pages H107–H108

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of February 3.

Page H108

Quorum Calls—Votes: No quorum calls or votes developed during the proceedings of the House today.

Adjournment: Met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

Committee Meetings

REDUCTION OF HIGH INTEREST RATES

Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy held a hearing on H.J. Res. 365, resolving that current economic policies must be reconsidered to bring and keep interest rates down, that the President and the administration and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall discourage speculative lending, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall reconsider its tentative decisions to reduce the targets for growth in money supply for 1982, and that the President shall comply with section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act. Testimony was heard from Stephen Entin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy, Department of the Treasury, and public witnesses.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education continued oversight hearings on the current status and administration of Federal student assistance programs. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Hearings continue February 2.

COMMUTER RAIL SAFETY

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism held a hearing on Commuter Rail Safety. Testimony was heard from Representative Coyne; Robert W. Blanchette, Administrator, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation; James Burnett, Jr., Acting Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board and David Gunn, General Manager, South Eastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority.

AT&T SETTLEMENT

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Consumer Protection, and Finance and the Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law of the Committee on the Judiciary concluded joint hearings on the AT&T settlement. Testimony was heard from William F. Baxter, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice.

WEST VIRGINIA WILDERNESS LANDS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks held a hearing on H.R. 5161, to designate certain lands in the Monongahela National Forest, W. Va., as wilderness; and to designate management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness. Testimony was heard from Representative Benedict; John B. Crowell, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, USDA and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT-TAX EXEMPTION FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights held an oversight hearing on the IRS tax exemption for private schools. Testimony was heard from Arthur Flemming, Chairman, Commission on Civil Rights and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT-IBM DISMISSAL

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Monopolies and Commercial Law held an oversight hearing on IBM Dismissal. Testimony was heard from William F. Baxter, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice.

Hearings continue February 3.

POSTAL REORGANIZATION ACT EFFECTIVENESS

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Subcommittee on Postal Operations and Services and the Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization continued joint hearings on the effectiveness of the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Hearings continue February 2.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION DEVELOPMENT ACT

Committee on Science and Technology: Concluded hearings on H.R. 4326, Small Business Innovation Development Act of 1981. Testimony was heard from Representative McCloskey and public witnesses.

Joint Meeting

ADMIRAL RICKOVER

Joint Economic Committee: Committee held hearings on the experiences of Admiral H. G. Rickover as a naval officer, receiving testimony from Admiral Rickover.

Committee will meet again Wednesday, February 3.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 29, 1982

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Finance, Subcommittee on International Trade, to hold hearings on S. 958, imposing an additional duty upon imported articles which are the products of a nonmarket economy country, 9:30 a.m., 2221 Dirksen Building.

Special Committee on Aging, business meeting, to consider the committee budget for 1982, and other committee business, 8:30 a.m., 1224 Dirksen Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, hearing on 1982 urgent supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation, 10 a.m., 2362 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

11 a.m., Friday, January 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate program is uncertain.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

11 a.m., Friday, January 29

House Chamber

Program for Friday: No legislative business is scheduled.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Applegate, Douglas, Ohio, E131
Bailey, Wendell, Mo., E133
Bereuter, Douglas K., Nebr., E120, E122, E128
Biaggi, Mario, N.Y., E121, E125, E132
Bingham, Jonathan B., N.Y., E130
Bonker, Don, Wash., E134, E129
Chisholm, Shirley, N.Y., E123
Coyne, James K., Pa., E121
Dannemeyer, William E., Calif., E140
Downey, Thomas J., N.Y., E125
Duncan, John J., Tenn., E129, E142
Dwyer, Bernard J., N.J., E131
Erdahl, Arlen, Minn., E123
Evans, Billy Lee, Ga., E144
Fish, Hamilton, Jr., N.Y., E142
Gaydos, Joseph M., Pa., E145
Goodling, William F., Pa., E133
Hall, Tony P., Ohio, E138
Holt, Marjorie S., Md., E123
Hughes, William J., N.J., E122
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E131
Lent, Norman F., N.Y., E127
McClory, Robert, Ill., E124, E130, E138
McDonald, Larry, Ga., E134
McGrath, Raymond J., N.Y., E126
Mineta, Norman Y., Calif., E125
Moffett, Anthony Toby, Conn., E138
Nelligan, James L., Pa., E128
Nelson, Bill, Fla., E136
Oberstar, James L., Minn., E127
Panetta, Leon E., Calif., E132
Richmond, Frederick W., N.Y., E132
Ritter, Don, Pa., E119, E126
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., N.J., E141
Solomon, Gerald B. H., N.Y., E121
Udall, Morris K., Ariz., E139
Winn, Larry, Jr., Kans., E120

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $104 for six months, $208 per year, or purchased for $1 per copy, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.